

The World of Ion of Chios

Edited by

VICTORIA JENNINGS
& ANDREA KATSAROS

ΜΝΕΜΟΣΥΝΗ SUPPLEMENTA MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND ROMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

The World of Ion of Chios

Mnemosyne

Bibliotheca Classica Batava

Monographs on Greek and
Roman Language and Literature

Editorial Board

I.J.H. de Jong

H. Pinkster

P.H. Schrijvers

H.S. Versnel

VOLUME 288

The World of Ion of Chios

Edited by

Victoria Jennings
Andrea Katsaros



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

ISSN 0169-8958

ISBN 978 90 04 16045 3

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishers,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission
from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by
Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Notes on Citation	xi
About the Contributors	xiii

Chapter One Introduction	1
VICTORIA JENNINGS and ANDREA KATSAROS	

PART ONE SURVIVAL

Chapter Two The Hocus of a Hedgehog: Ion's Versatility ...	17
JOHN HENDERSON	
Chapter Three Shot from the Canon: Sources, Selections, Survivals	45
GUY OLDING	
Chapter Four The Poet and the Place: A Modern Chian Perspective on Ion of Chios and his Home Island	64
NIKOS K. HAVIARAS	

PART TWO ION *SUNGRAPHEOS*

Chapter Five Ion's <i>Epidemiai</i> and Plutarch's Ion	75
CHRISTOPHER PELLING	
Chapter Six Ion of Chios and Politics	110
ANNE GEDDES	
Chapter Seven Ion the Wineman: The Manipulation of Myth	139
GUY OLDING	
Chapter Eight Trapped between Athens and Chios: A Relationship in Fragments	155
ALASTAIR BLANSHARD	

PART THREE

ION THE POET

Chapter Nine Ion of Chios and the Politics of <i>Polychordia</i>	179
TIMOTHY POWER	
Chapter Ten Snowy Helen and Bull-Faced Wine: Ion and the Logic of Poetic Language	206
MICHAEL CLARKE	
Chapter Eleven Staging Empire and Other in Ion's Sympotica	217
ANDREA KATSAROS	

PART FOUR

ION THE TRAGEDIAN

Chapter Twelve Ion of Chios: Tragedy as Commodity at the Athenian Exchange	243
ALEXANDER STEVENS	
Chapter Thirteen Ion of Chios, Sophocles, and Myth	266
JUDITH MAITLAND	
Chapter Fourteen Looking for <i>Omphale</i>	282
PAT EASTERLING	

PART FIVE

ION THE PHILOSOPHER?

Chapter Fifteen Playing the Pythagorean: Ion's <i>Triagmos</i>	295
HAN BALTUSSEN	
Chapter Sixteen Legwork: Ion's Socrates	319
RICHARD FLETCHER	
Chapter Seventeen Ion's Hymn to Kairos	331
VICTORIA JENNINGS	
Bibliography	347
Concordance to the Fragments of Ion of Chios	383
Index of Passages Cited	391
Greek Index	416
General Index	420

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“Each friend that comes annoys, that goes affronts, as Ion has it”. We are fortunate that we have not suffered such discontentment as Plutarch describes (71* Leurini = *De tranquillitate animi* 466d).

A number of colleagues and friends have assisted and encouraged this project; in particular, we would like to thank the original participants in our panel on Ion of Chios at the Australian Society for Classical Studies conference in 2003. They justified our faith in the project from its conception. In addition, for their practical help or personal encouragement, we would like to thank Pat Easterling; John Henderson; Polly Low; the late Robert Ussher; Peter Wilson; Ian Worthington; Noriko Yasumura. Alastair Blanshard and Alexander Stevens stepped manfully into the debate on volume structure. Victoria would also like to thank her tolerant colleagues Yeng Chiam and Natalie Cahill.

The editors are grateful to the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Adelaide for financial assistance towards a (second) Colloquium on Ion of Chios at the University in September 2004, which enabled Australian contributors to present ideas and works in progress. This workshop would not have been possible without the administrative *nous*, not to mention unflagging efforts, of Dr Han Baltussen.

The editors have benefited from nomination as Visiting Research Fellows to the University of Adelaide.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of ancient authors follow *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd edn). Abbreviations of periodicals follow *L'Année philologique*. Other abbreviations found in the text:

<i>ABV</i>	Beazley, J. D. (1956) <i>Attic Black-figure Vase-painters</i> . Oxford
<i>ARV</i> ²	Beazley, J. D. (1963) <i>Attic Red-figure Vase-painters</i> , 3 vols, 2nd edn. Oxford
<i>CEG</i>	Hansen, P. A. (1983–89) <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca</i> , 2 vols. Berlin
<i>CHCL</i>	Easterling, P. E. and Knox, B. M. W. (eds.) (1985) <i>Cambridge History of Classical Literature I: Greek Literature</i> . Cambridge
<i>CPG</i>	Leutsch, E. L. von and Schneidewin, F. G. (1839–51) <i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , 2 vols. Göttingen
<i>DK</i>	Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (1951) <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , 3 vols, 6th edn. Dublin and Zürich
<i>EGF</i>	Davies, M. (1988) <i>Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> . Göttingen
<i>FGrH</i>	Jacoby, F. (1923–) <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Berlin and Leiden
<i>IEG</i> ²	<i>see</i> West
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> (1873–)
Leurini	Leurini, L. (1992, 2000a) <i>Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23). Amsterdam
<i>LCS</i>	Trendall, A. D. (1967) <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily</i> . Oxford
<i>LCS</i> Suppl.	Trendall, A. D. (1983) <i>The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Third Supplement (Consolidated)</i> (BICS Supplement 41). London
<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> (1981–). Zürich
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Stuart Jones, H. and McKenzie, R. (1940) <i>Greek-English Lexicon with a Supplement</i> , 9th edn. Oxford
<i>OCD</i> ³	Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (eds.) (1996) <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , 3rd edn. Oxford and New York
<i>PMG</i>	Page, D. L. (1962) <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> . Oxford

- PCG* Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (1983–) *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Berlin and New York
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (1923–)
- SH* Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (1983) *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin and New York
- SIG* Dittenberger, W. (1915–24) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols, 3rd edn. Leipzig
- TrGF* Snell, B., Kannicht, R. and Radt, S. (1971–85) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 4 vols. Göttingen
- West West, M. L. (1992) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. 2, 2nd edn. Oxford [*IEG*²]

NOTES ON CITATION

Ion's fragments are cited by reference to Leurini's editions (1992, 2000a), a standard reference (e.g., *FGrH*, *TrGF*, DK, West *IEG*², Page *PMG*) and the ancient authority.

Ascription follows Leurini's model:

- * the work to which a fragment is ascribed is uncertain;
- ** a dubious ascription;
- *** a spurious ascription.

In general, 'T' indicates 'Testimonium' and 'F' 'Fragment'.

A concordance to the fragments cited in this volume may be found at the end. In addition, the reader is directed to the concordances of Leurini 2000a and 2000b.

Transliteration follows general conventions.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

HAN BALTUSSEN is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Adelaide.

ALASTAIR BLANSHARD is Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Sydney.

MICHAEL CLARKE is Professor of Classics at the National University of Ireland, Galway.

PAT EASTERLING is Regius Professor Emerita of Greek at the University of Cambridge.

RICHARD FLETCHER is Assistant Professor in Greek and Latin at The Ohio State University.

ANNE GEDDES is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Adelaide.

NIKOS K. HAVIARAS teaches Greek and History at the First Lycaean of Chios.

JOHN HENDERSON is Professor of Classics at the University of Cambridge.

VICTORIA JENNINGS is a Visiting Research Fellow at the University of Adelaide.

ANDREA KATSAROS is a Visiting Research Fellow at the University of Adelaide.

JUDITH MAITLAND is Senior Lecturer in Classics and Ancient History at the University of Western Australia.

GUY OLDING is affiliated with the Australian War Memorial and Australian National University, Canberra.

CHRISTOPHER PELLING is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Oxford.

TIMOTHY POWER is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Washington at Seattle.

ALEXANDER STEVENS teaches Latin and Greek at Sydney Grammar School and is an Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Sydney.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

VICTORIA JENNINGS AND ANDREA KATSAROS

When an important work of art has utterly disappeared by demolition and dispersal, we can still detect its perturbations upon other bodies in the field of influence.¹

Ion of Chios has been neglected for too long. While editions of Ion's approximately one hundred and fifty fragments exist, commentary is sparse, and there is no over-arching evaluation of his works in English or any other language.² Ion's name is liberally peppered throughout standard texts on mid-fifth century BC historical, political, cultural and literary topics, but he is not often considered beyond the footnotes. His works are frequently plundered, but seldom recognized for the riches they provide in themselves. Our educated non-Athenian's *polyeideia* is better conceived as a kaleidoscope whose shifting facets illuminate a different perspective with its every turn.³ For this reason, these texts and Ion's polymathy demand our attention: they offer rare insights into how a Chiot, in an unparalleled period of literary and artistic productivity, conceptualized himself and his world across disparate genres.

Reconstructions of Ion's life are subject to the usual caveats which obtain in any representation of the 'lives' of ancient literary figures: much of our 'knowledge' derives from readings, both partial and partisan, of his works;⁴ indeed, our 'knowledge' might well surprise Ion himself. He was born between 490 and 480 on the Ionian island of

¹ Kubler (1962) 16.

² Editions: Koepke (1836); Nieberding (1836); Allègre (1890); von Blumenthal (1939); Farina (1961); Leurini (1992, 2000a).

³ *Polyeideia*: see T15a Leurini = Callim. *Iamb.* 13.43–9 (fr. 203 Pfeiffer) with T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in Callim. *Iamb.* 13 (fr. 203 Pfeiffer). On Callimachus' Ion see, in particular, Hunter (1997) 45–7; Acosta-Hughes (2002) 88–95; Henderson in this volume.

⁴ Caveats: Fairweather (1974); Lefkowitz (1981).

Chios.⁵ He was obviously well-educated, and from this we presume that his family were wealthy and well-connected.⁶ As a young man he met Cimon in Athens (c. 466/5), and travelled extensively throughout the Greek world: perhaps he was even accompanied by that Athenian general and statesman.⁷ At one time, Ion sat with Aeschylus at the Isthmian Games.⁸ Wealth and connections allowed him access to the most famous politicians, military figures, writers and leading families who would be the focus of his *Epidemiai*. He was a contemporary of, and commentator on, Sophocles, Pericles, Themistocles, Socrates, Archelaus and Pherecydes. He was almost certainly in Athens from 470 to 461, 451 to 443, and from 433 until some time after 428.⁹ He was a prize winner in Athenian tragic competitions (third in 428), and in the dithyramb.¹⁰ The impression Ion made was significant enough to merit a mention in Aristophanes' *Peace* 835. Those who consider this to be an 'obituary' deduce that Ion died before its production in 422/1.¹¹

Among his many verse and prose works were tragedies (*Agamemnon*, *Alcmene*, *Argeioi*, *Eurytidai*, *Laertes*, *Mega Drama*, *Teukros*, *Phoenix* [or *Kain-*

⁵ 'Precise' dating depends on complex re-arrangements of significant events in Ion's life. See Jacoby (1947a) and West (1985) 71–4 (in favour of 484–1) for admirable summaries; cf. Huxley (1965) 30. Others prefer c. 490: Webster (1936) 263. Mattingly (1977) 236: born 479, first visit to Athens 462.

⁶ Jacoby (1947a) 4n4.

⁷ Arrival in Athens in the mid 460s: Jacoby (1947a) 2; West (1985) 72–4. Ion and Cimon: 105* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F12 = Plut. *Cim.* 5.3; 106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6; 107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = Plut. *Cim.* 16.8–10. The earlier date for Ion's birth would enable him to meet Cimon c. 475, around the time of the Eion inscriptions sometimes ascribed to him: 140*** Leurini = Aeschin. *Ctesiph.* 183–5; Plut. *Cim.* 7.4–5. We note that the return of Cimon from ostracism coincides with Ion's first tragic production (c. 451): see Jacoby (1947a) 1n1.

⁸ 108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de; *Quomodo adul.* 29f; Stob. 3.29.89 W-H; cf. 101 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F7 = Schol. M Aesch. *Pers.* 432. Probable dates are the Isthmian Games between 464 and 458: West (1985) 72. Cf. Schneidewin (1853); Jacoby (1947a) 3–4: Aeschylus would have been in Athens during Ion's first visit.

⁹ Cf. Webster (1936) 264.

¹⁰ The *Suda* dates the production of his first tragedy to the 82nd Olympiad (451–448): T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios (ι 487). Victories: T6 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T6 = *TrGF* DID C 13 = Argum. in Eur. *Hipp.* 2; T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = *TrGF* 19 T2b, T3 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f; *Suda* α 731.

¹¹ T7 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T2a = Ar. *Pax* 832–7. "Obituary": Jacoby (1947a) 1. Death: Webster (1936) 263–4 [before 421]; Jacoby (1947a) 1 [summer 422 to winter 422/1]; Huxley (1965) 29 [Spring 421]; Mattingly (1977) 238 [422/1]; Dover (1986) 27 [shortly before Spring 421]; Lendle (1992) 28 [423/22–422/21].

eus or *Oineus*], *Phoenix* 1, *Phoenix* 2, *Phrouroi* and others uncertain);¹² at least one satyr play (*Omphale*); perhaps comedies;¹³ elegies and lyrics, dithyrambs, paeans, scolia, epigrams, an encomium to the otherwise unknown “Skythiades”¹⁴ and a *Hymn to Kairos*;¹⁵ the elusive *Sunekdemetikos* or *Presbeutikos*;¹⁶ the philosophical treatise *Triagmos*; other prose works of (local) history and mythography (*Chiou Ktisis*) and ‘biography’ (*Epidemiai*). There are also pseudepigrapha which attest the resonance of his ‘name’.

One pronouncement has prejudiced opinions on Ion’s abilities since antiquity:

In lyrics, again, would you choose to be Bacchylides rather than Pindar, or in tragedy Ion of Chios rather than Sophocles? In both pairs the first named is impeccable and a master of elegance in the smooth style... The truth is rather that no one in his senses would give the single tragedy of *Oedipus* for all the works of Ion together. (T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = [Longinus] *On the Sublime* 33.5; tr. Fyfe and Russell)

Ion was born in extraordinary times: would this relegation to the ‘second string’ have occurred had his contemporaries not been such outstanding literary achievers?¹⁷ Few of Ion’s contemporaries can be considered his equal in *polyeideia*. However, the extant fragments testify more to the corpus’ past significance as a treasure trove for polyhistor

¹² His plays may have numbered ten tetralogies: see T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios (ι 487) with Webster (1936) 264. The ascription to Ion of a tragedy about Gyges and Candaules is problematic but fascinating: see 152*** Leurini = *POxy* 2382 = *TrGF* Adesp. F664 with Huxley (1965) 43ff.; Pack (1965) no. 1707; Dover (1986) 28n3. Ion’s *Agamemnon* may have influenced that of Seneca: 2 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F2 = *Stob.* 4.52.36; Stackmann (1950) 219; Seaford (1984) 250 and n25; Leurini (1990) 22.

¹³ T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = *TrGF* 19 T2b, T3 = *Schol. Ar. Pax* 835; T11 Leurini = *Suda* s.v. *dithyrambodidaskaloi* (δ 1029). Comedy and tragedy is highly unusual: see Taplin (1986) 163 and n1.

¹⁴ 88 Leurini = 743 *PMG* = Miller *Mélanges* 361–2 (*Zenob. Ath.* 2.35 [4.270 Bühler]; cf. *Zenob.* 1.48 *CPG*); *Phot.* 617.23; *Suda* υ 108; *Paus. Att.* υ 5 Erbse.

¹⁵ 87 Leurini = 742 *PMG* = *Paus.* 5.14.9.

¹⁶ Some consider *Sunekdemetikos* to be a chapter of *Epidemiai*: see 113 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F8 = *Pollux* 2.88; Nieberding (1836) 76: “travels with a companion”; Maass (1925) 443–5. It may be the same work as *Presbeutikos*, “which some think to be spurious (*nothos*)”: T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = *TrGF* 19 T2b, T3 = *Schol. Ar. Pax* 835; T11 Leurini = *Suda* s.v. *dithyrambodidaskaloi* (δ 1029).

¹⁷ Cf. Dover (1986) 27. The ascription to Ion of the fragments of a satyric *Oeneus* (?) because its style “betrays some lack of polish” (Hunt 1911: 61), and thus cannot be Sophoclean, illustrates his perceived inferiority: see 151*** Leurini = *POxy* 1083 + 2453 = *TrGF* *Soph.* FF **1130–1133; von Blumenthal (1939) 56–64; Carden (1974) 137.

and philologists than to any thought of preservation for intrinsic literary merits, or interest in Ion himself. Ion has always defied categorization: he is “Ion the tragedian” even to those ancient authorities who cite his prose works.¹⁸

John Henderson’s paper questions our hitherto indiscriminating reception of testimonia about this fifth century’s “jack of all trades”. Henderson’s ‘archaeology’ of the collection and ordering of knowledge in the entries on Ion in the three editions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* prepares the ground for his revelations about our inherited stratigraphy. Tracing all encyclopedic entries back to the *Pinakes* of Callimachus, Henderson maps out the priorities of Alexandrian criticism, scrutinizing the/our presentations of Ion as chameleon-like polymathic prodigy, one “just outside the medals”. Who wanted (us) to see him as a phenomenon?

The processing of Ion’s troublesome *polyeideia* at Alexandria began a decomposition of the Ionic *corpus* which was later exacerbated by centuries of “textual guardianship”.¹⁹ Guy Olding’s first paper complements Henderson’s analysis of Ion’s reception. Olding examines the remains of Ion’s works in terms of the problems associated with the selection, survival and reproduction of ancient literature, as well as the process of canon formation. Olding traces the procedures by which this could occur and the crises which affected it, and he further identifies the predilections which either ensured the survival of authors’ various works or, indeed, their disappearance forever. Olding gives emphasis to the importance of on-going cultural relevance, and considers whether Ion’s experimental works were regarded as oddities, and therefore fell victim to a literary culling process which had little time for what was possibly regarded as trivia.

It is clear that we have inherited a prescriptive breakdown of these texts into rigid, genre-based classifications, and this has influenced all subsequent reception and produced a somewhat anachronistic myopia. We need to question these ‘classifications’: inevitably they are artificial, and, although convenient, they obscure a generic instability and obviate our access to the man and his world.²⁰

¹⁸ West (1985) 71. For example, “Ion the tragedian”: *Klisis* 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10; “Ion the poet”: *Klisis* 99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e (see Schmid 1947: 46) and *Epidemiai* 109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = Plut. *Per.* 5.3.

¹⁹ Gregory (1997) 43.

²⁰ Cf. Marincola (1999) 300: categorization can, in fact, “stigmatize” works.

The papers in this volume engage directly with the nature of these disparate texts. Thematically-driven analyses based on close textual readings offer a complementary treatment of the Ionic corpus. Ion's originality in prose works is conspicuous. *Ktisis* was an account (*sungraphie*) of the foundation and mythic history of Chios. Many see it as a 'first': "the earliest prose work of its kind that has left any record".²¹ It can also be viewed as part of the transition from verse myths of foundation to early historiographic writing.²² Scarcity of comparative evidence reduces our ability to distinguish originality from emulation. Ion was certainly receptive to innovation: his elegy on the eleven-stringed lyre testifies to an interest in 'New Music' (see below). His *Hymn to Kairos* and his uniquely titled *Mega Drama* indicate an inventive independence for which he deserves our closer attention.²³ *Epidemiai*, too, is regarded as a "pioneering work".²⁴ It comprises a series of anecdotes whose structure is barely attested, but whose proto-dialogic form sits tantalizingly between the scattered apophthegmatic vignettes about the Seven Wise Men (or Simonides) and the more fully developed 'biography' manifest in Xenophon's works, or the *Lives* of the poets, or the Platonic dialogues.²⁵ These sketches communicate Ion's estimations of Sophocles, Cimon, Aeschylus, Pericles, Archelaus, Socrates and Themistocles.²⁶ The meetings occurred on Chios, at Athens, and elsewhere; the circumstances are generally convivial, and the tone is, superficially, light-hearted.

²¹ West (1985) 74. *Peri Chiou*: 99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e. A *sungraphie*: 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10. The date of composition is unknown. Jacoby (1947a) 7: "a juvenile work", c. 460. In verse? See Cerri (1977); Bowie (1986) 32–3; Dover (1986) 32.

²² Dover (1986) 32; cf. Jacoby (1947a) 4–7.

²³ *Mega Drama*: for example, 21 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17 = Hsch. o 922; Phot. 339.12. Comedy? See Pickard-Cambridge (1939). von Blumenthal (1939) 35 suggests that it dealt with Prometheus' theft of fire.

²⁴ West (1985) 75. Huxley (1965) 31: Ion invented the "genre"; "some of the first memoirs ever written": Lucas (1959) 129; "*erste Beispiel persönlicher Memoiren*": von Fritz (1967) 1.99; cf. Mattingly (1977) 236. Rutherford (2001) 45: an early member of the [Hellenistic] periegetic "genre"; cf. Cohen (2001) 97–8; Arafat (1992) 388. Dating: see Dover (1986) 34 [after 440]; West (1985) 72: 430s or earlier 420s. Few dates can be considered secure: see, for example, Marincola (1999) 297n60 on "[a]nachronistic notions of publication".

²⁵ Dover (1986) 34–7; West (1985) 75; Wehrli (1973) 204. Are we sure that these "quasi-biographical writings...were not suitable for oral presentation" (*CHCL* I: 8)?

²⁶ Sophocles: 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d. Pericles: 109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = Plut. *Per.* 5.3; 110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = Plut. *Per.* 28.7. Themistocles: 106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6; 112* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F11 = Phot. α 466; *Suda* α 729. Socrates and Archelaus: 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23; Pherecydes: 92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120.

However, this ‘traditional’ sketch is too simple and relies overmuch on preconceived notions of the form of *Epidemiai*. Richard Fletcher examines a fragment often assigned to *Epidemiai*, namely the journey (*apodemia*) that the young Socrates (and, by implication, Ion?) undertook with Archelaus to Samos (111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23). Ion’s portrayal of Socrates deserves reconsideration: it is our earliest ‘portrait’, but because the image is one of Socrates travelling—and is thus inconsistent with all of the customarily respected Socratic authorities—the philosophical nature of this journey has been downplayed. Amid multiple narratives which seek to make Athens central to Socrates’ life, Ion’s fragment presents an Ionian tradition that is extraordinarily problematical for the neatly transitional history of Greek philosophy as presented by the Hellenistic doxographers and Diogenes Laertius.

Epidemiai is typically exploited for two distinct purposes: to cast light on great Athenians,²⁷ and to reconstruct an account of ‘biography’s’ development as a ‘genre’. The worth of both approaches cannot be gainsaid: nevertheless, the former is grounded in a well-worn Athenocentrism, and the latter’s teleological approach concentrates on the elements which make up rudimentary biographical composition. Let us focus, rather, on the contents of these fragments themselves. Does Ion’s use of the Ionic dialect allow him to tap into a stratum of prestigious and authoritative older literature?²⁸ To what extent, despite first-hand reporting, does Ion’s authorial position *conceal* how he negotiates his place in the intricate network of friendship and reciprocity that characterized his Greek world?

Christopher Pelling explores our reception of Ion as a generic innovator and experimentalist, while raising the question of how far different writings would have been felt *at the time* to belong to different ‘genres’. Rather, should not ‘biography’ be regarded as a strand within historiography? How have issues of genre affected Ion’s reception? Pelling analyzes Plutarch’s quotations of Ion in his *Lives*, noting that the interpretation of particular fragments may more often be affected by the interests of the citing author than has usually been acknowledged. He compares Plutarch’s use of Stesimbrotus with his use of Ion—in particular, the nuances between “Ion” and “Ion the poet”. Pelling con-

²⁷ For example, Huxley (1965).

²⁸ Swain (1996) 17: “Language is one of the most important areas in which cultural groups may adopt definitions for themselves and/or against others”. Cf. Goldhill (2002a). What is at stake in the retention of Ionic dialect? Cf. Elsner (2001b).

cludes his “back to front” investigation with a return to fundamentals: he stresses the significance of viewing Ion as an *islander*, and emphasizes how Ion’s apparently depoliticized stance was not necessarily “politically value-free”.

Anne Geddes examines some of the practicalities of Ion’s situation as an islander at a time when the Delian alliance was looking more like an empire. Geddes surveys the three *Epidemiai* vignettes concerning Cimon, Pericles and Sophocles: what has traditionally be drawn from these fragments, and what picture of the “open-hearted Ionian”²⁹ is thus gained? In the light of Ion’s ‘Ionianism’ and his proximity to the literary traditions of the east, Geddes reconstructs his individual understanding of the fifth century Athenian intellectual and political milieu, and his place within it.

Epidemiai is “wholly Ionic in language, not simply in its phonology and morphology but also in its vocabulary”.³⁰ This is not surprising: the origins of biographical writing are often assumed to lie in Ionia and Asia Minor,³¹ and Ion is thought to have written for a Chian/Ionian audience.³² Since ethnic, cultural and political authority, identity and representation are intimately connected with geographical *loci*,³³ no close examination can afford to ignore the significance of his Chian and Ionian roots. To this end, Nikos K. Haviaras offers a contemporary—but not parochial—Chian perspective on Ion’s works and their reception. The value of this paper lies precisely in its delineation of the traditional approach—surprisingly rarely questioned in Chian (let alone wider) scholarship—towards the relationship of Ion—and Chios—to Athenian imperialism. Haviaras’ survey, and his conception of Ion as the “good citizen” of the Greek world, provides the linch-pin around which all other readings in the past have turned; he provides the basis against which all future readings must be measured. Haviaras emphasizes the neglect of Ion, and, in this context, his remark that his native town commemorates Ion only by naming a sixty metre dead-end street after him becomes particularly apposite.

The rewards to be gained by pressurizing such past evaluations are immeasurable: for example, Andrea Katsaros offers a reading of dissents

²⁹ Lesky (1966) 409.

³⁰ Dover (1986) 32.

³¹ Momigliano (1993) 34–8.

³² West (1985) 76.

³³ Elsner (1995) 137; cf. Preston (2001) 88.

and incongruities in Ion's sympotic fragments—texts which allow us to 'listen at the cracks' of elite social interactions. Fragments of Ion's elegies and 'biographies' which have previously been read 'softly' for their assumed generic pro-Athenian literariness and intellectualism are subject to a harder hermeneusis. An unsuspected flipside to previous orderings of Ion's staging/s of Empire and Other is revealed when the personal, "nationalistic", "unorthodox" voice is privileged.

By relegating Ion's 'Chian-ness' to the periphery, we may fail to comprehend the complexity of his situation. This is illustrated by the on-going debate on the identity of the *basileus* in one elegiac fragment. References to Procles *et al.*, with their Spartan implications, are read alongside 'information' gleaned from *Epidemiai* and elsewhere: Ion admired Cimon; Cimon admired Sparta; Ion went to Sparta with Cimon; Ion wrote this elegy.³⁴ Hence, this sympotic elegy is measured, in the first instance, against assumptions made about Ion's (traditionally seen as pro-Athenian) relationship with Athens. As Katsaros elaborates, Ion's 'Chian-ness' ought to be accorded equal relevance.

Complementary to this is Alastair Blanshard's chapter which examines how our "pro-Athenian historian of Chios"³⁵ constructs his authorial identity in his prose works, particularly in the 'Chian' *Ktisis*. The very existence of *Ktisis* demonstrates that Ion's *alleged* Athenophilia did not entirely engulf his Chian identity.³⁶ Privileging Ion's (presumed) Athenophilia provides only one half of the diptych. Blanshard notes that traditional accounts of Ion stress his singularity, and tend to isolate him and his work from their broader cultural context, disregarding the vital realities of a Chian foreigner who had to live with Athenian imperial hegemony. Against a background of Chian-Athenian inter-state relations—political, economic and cultural—Blanshard sees Ion as part of a cosmopolitan self-aware elite, and a far from disinterested observer of the circumstances within which he had to operate.³⁷

³⁴ 90 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T5c = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c. Jacoby (1947a) 7–9: "The Drinking Song for Archidamos", an "enthusiastic" poem reflecting "the age of the poet, who had hardly reached his twentieth year" (that is, 463/2). West (1985) 74 disagrees, reading it as the work of "a somewhat maturer man" (c. 450).

³⁵ West (1985) 75.

³⁶ Jacoby (1947a) 6. Cf. Alcock (1996) 244: "guide books are never simple".

³⁷ For example, it has been suggested that Ion played an 'official' role in Chian-Athenian relations as *proxenos*: see Barron (1986) 94; Mattingly (1977) 237. Cf. Leurini (2000a) 85 on Ion's *Presbeutikos* reflecting his experiences as such.

Let us ask how we can situate man and work within a broader fifth-century Greek milieu. Moving away from the previous technical explorations of Ion's elegiac fragment on the eleven-stringed lyre,³⁸ Timothy Power examines its sociological implications in the light of what it can tell us about Ion's contribution to the cultural politics of music in later fifth-century Athens. Power highlights the progressive nature of Ion's endorsement of *polychordia*, as well as his apparent nose-thumbing at conservative criticism and its politicizing agenda. This places Ion centrally within contemporary debate on the New Music, and attests to the role of 'private' sympotic poetry in the promotion and contestation of trends in 'public' Athenian musical culture. As Power notes, other poetic works of Ion were doubtless regarded as equally innovative.

Ion's creative versatility permeates his fragments, both poetic and prose. His prose work *Triagmos* was apparently a philosophical 'treatise' based on Pythagorean concepts which originated in nearby Samos.³⁹ Han Baltussen examines the five fragments of the uniquely titled *Triagmos*, which give us a glimpse of Ion's thoughts on life, luck and virtue. The issue of how philosophical Ion and his treatise really were is addressed by providing context, seeking coherence between the fragments, and examining their relationship with contemporary Pythagorean thought. Was Ion perhaps not completely serious?

To what extent did cosmological, numerical and ethical elements influence this work, and to what extent did they affect Ion's other works? With these questions in mind, Victoria Jennings examines Ion's *Hymn to Kairos*. Only the title survives—indicative of the problems facing any interpreter of Ion's fragmentary literary remains. Jennings traces the development of *kairos* (the 'apropos') as a concept of increasing ethical and aesthetic importance in Ion's lifetime, and analyzes Ion's choice of this abstract personification against a background of intellectual exchanges—Pythagorean and otherwise—from Southern Italy to the eastern Mediterranean, and most particularly at the great panhellenic festival sites.

³⁸ 93 Leurini = 32 West = Cleonid. *Isag. harm.* 12, p. 202 Jan; Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius *Harmonica* p. 116 Jonker.

³⁹ Alternative titles are *Triagmoi*, *Kosmologikos* and *Peri meteoron*: T9a Leurini = *FGrH* T3 = Harpocration s.v. Ion; T9b Leurini = *FGrH* F25c = *Suda* s.v. Orpheus (o 654); T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios (i 487); T8 Leurini = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835. Dating: West (1985) 72 prefers the 420s.

Jennings touches upon Ion's philological interests: his fondness for *hapaxlegomena*, unusual vocabulary and other re-uses of panhellenic epic traditions (including his sons' Homeric names).⁴⁰ This is taken up more fully by Alexander Stevens who suggests that we view the tragedies of the foreigner Ion in terms of the "commodification" of tragedy. Drawing upon the anecdote of Ion's wine gift to the Athenians,⁴¹ Stevens stresses that Ion's 'Chian-ness' is essential not only for dismantling this anecdote (wine is *the* Chian product), but it also provides a more allusive reading of his tragic fragments, many of which are inspired by that other famous son of Chios, Homer.⁴² Stevens' analysis of Ion's subject matter and use of language in *Phrouroi*, as well as other plays connected with the epic tradition, augments our understanding of the "complex social tournament where cultural standing was the major prize".

How does Ion utilize inherited literary traditions as he engages with contemporary poets and poetic creativity? In the 'Sophocles and the boy' episode in *Epidemiai*, the exchanges concerning Sophocles, Phrynichus, the *didaskalos* and the narrator reveal much about poetic and intellectual rivalry, the poetic craft and the anxiety of influence. However, this is rarely realized because the episode is primarily drawn upon as anecdotal 'evidence' about Sophocles himself.⁴³

The context of this episode is sympotic, as is the vignette concerning Ion's first meeting with Cimon.⁴⁴ Baton of Sinope characterized Ion as *philopotes* (lover of wine),⁴⁵ and there is no doubt that Ion's extant works

⁴⁰ Style and vocabulary: Webster (1936) 267ff. (Ion and Sophocles); Wilamowitz-Moellendorf ("der freund des abstrusen") in Jacoby (1945) 210n193. Ion in the lexicographers: Leurini (1984) 170–3. Of course, to paraphrase Aly (1929) 80, the lexicographers serve us only the raisins from the cake. Children—Achilles (?): Barron (1986) 94, 101–3; Tydeus: T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3; see Mattingly (1977) 237–9.

⁴¹ T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios (τ 487); T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = *TrGF* 19 T2b, T3 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f; *Suda* α 731.

⁴² Cf. Sandbach (1958–59) on echoes of the *Odyssey* in Ion's epigram on Pherecydes: 92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120.

⁴³ 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d. A rare exception is Ford (2002) 192–4. The episode has also generated fulsome commentary on the colour of Apollo's hair: Beazley (1949); La Penna (1955); Bernadini Marzolla (1982); Leurini (1987); Ricciardelli Apicella (1989).

⁴⁴ 106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6.

⁴⁵ 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41. Cimon is likewise characterized in Eupolis *Poleis* F221 *PCG* = Plut. *Cim.* 15.3. As Plutarch adds, just *imagine* what he would have accomplished if he had been *sober*. On *philopotes* see Vaio (1971) 338–41: "the disease of gentlemen" (*Wasps* 80); Bowie (1995) 116–7. Aelian's Ion prefers unmixed wine: T21b Leurini = Ael. *VH* 2.41.

are often wine-related. One particularly bizarre wine-related image is the subject of Michael Clarke's paper. Like Easterling and Maitland (see below), Clarke, too, draws close parallels between Ion's language and that of Sophocles. Focusing on such images as "bull-faced wine" and "snowy Helen",⁴⁶ Clarke scrutinizes Ion's experiments with "deliberate and self-conscious" novel strategies of metaphor and language, along with complex allusions to the traditional vocabulary of colours as used by earlier poets (specifically Homer). Using evidence also drawn from the anecdotal tradition, such as the *Epidemiai* episode, Clarke suggests that Ion's often bizarre poetic imagery may have been part of an ongoing discourse of exploratory image-making among the poets of his generation.

Sympotic performance could include monodic and choral lyric poetry, *scolia* or drinking songs, elegy and iambus, recitation from tragedy, and other intellectual 'games': as such, the symposium provided an ideal forum for Ion's *polyeideia*. His *polymathia* reflects a background of Ionian natural philosophy from which his works cannot be divorced. Ion gauged well the contemporary heterological interests of his audiences: Lydian and Egyptian practices, Athens, Corinth, Sparta and Euboea, food-stuffs, dolphins, types of fish, giant clams, wine and cups, monstrous serpents, fowling, cock-fighting, the moon, the number three, *tyche*, cosmetics, beards, mistletoe, music and maxims.

This volume embraces what Veyne terms "the plurality of modalities of belief"⁴⁷—characteristic of early Ionian thought. The reprocessing of myth in tragedy, and other texts, illustrates that a measure of control of the present can be achieved through a controlled re-use of the past.⁴⁸ Consider Euripides' *Ion*: despite his name and considerable mythic genealogy, the eponymous hero is emphatically Athenian. Myths are powerful and can be used to influence conceptions of political, social and cultural identity. Ion's keen grasp of Athenian self-definition, in contrast with the barbarian Other, is apparent even in a simple reading of his positioning of Heracles against the Lydian queen Omphale.

Ion's satyr play *Omphale* is the subject of two papers in this volume. Pat Easterling draws together all the evidence for this play, which, with

⁴⁶ 86* Leurini = 744 *PMG* = Ath. 35de; 55 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F46 = Hsch. v 601; Phot. 301.7.

⁴⁷ Veyne (1988) xi.

⁴⁸ Thus, aetiological works use the past to explore the present and are linked to constructions of identity: see Preston (2001) 94.

nineteen extant fragments, is better attested than most.⁴⁹ As she notes, the story of Heracles and Omphale has obvious appeal for its playful cross-dressing theme, and the Lydian setting may have been part of its attraction. Easterling considers possible links with Sophocles in language and plot, and, drawing upon the reception of the myth in literature and iconography, is able to offer a reconstruction of some of its elements.

The links with Sophocles explored by Easterling are elaborated by Judith Maitland. Drawing upon the account in *Epidemiai* of Ion's meeting with Sophocles, and the link established by Pseudo-Longinus (quoted above), Maitland explores signs of shared interests between the two poets, particularly in their treatments of the Heracleian legends; and, based on an analysis of Ion's style and expression, she reassigns a dubious Sophoclean fragment to him.

All re-workings are potentially comprehensible to an audience accustomed to mutually viable contestations of mythic accounts: thus, for example, Ion's dithyrambic *Antigone* can differ from the presentations of Sophocles and others.⁵⁰ Another example is Ion's reinterpretation of the genealogy of Oinopion, and thus that of Theseus and Cimon, subordinating Chian concepts of self-definition to those of the powerful ally.⁵¹ A more intricate illustration is Ion's alleged non-inclusion, in *Ktisis*, of Athens' status as mother-city.⁵² Both of these curious treatments are examined by Guy Olding in his second paper—an analysis of Ion's *Ktisis*, a prototype of mythographic writing. What can *Ktisis* and other of Ion's fragments tell us about contemporary taste for, and manipulations of, mythological representation? Olding explores Ion's selection of unusual, parochial myths in the light of political rivalries and friendships—both inter-state and personal.

* * *

⁴⁹ 22–38 + 73* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 FF17a–33a + F59. See Pechstein and Krumeich (1999); Cipolla (2003).

⁵⁰ 83 Leurini = 740 *PMG* = Sallustius *Argum. in Soph. Ant.* See, for example, van Erp Taalman Kip (1990) 78–80.

⁵¹ 96* Leurini = 29 West = Plut. *Thes.* 20.2: τήν ποτε Θεσείδης ἔκτισεν Οἰνοπίων (“...this, once, Theseus' son Oinopion founded”). See Casevitz (1985) on κτίζω and the language of colonization.

⁵² 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10.

We suggest that there is no prescriptive order in which any reader ought to approach *The World of Ion of Chios*. Indeed, our introductory survey does not follow the loose thematic arrangement by which the contents are ordered within. Given our stated interest in challenging “rigid, genre-based classifications”, readers (as a natural corollary) might feel justified in looking askance at our practical organization of the chapters. We acknowledge that our approach might raise such questions. To this end, Henderson’s succinct pronouncement proves axiomatic: “Versatility is hard to think with”.

Pelling outlines a further challenge taken up by our contributors:

...we should also remember how scarce and selective are our materials for reconstructing this period...Because this is ‘classical’, we somehow think we must understand it better than other periods; but there is a real sense in which we understand the intellectual (perhaps even the political) life of second century AD Greece better than the middle fifty years of the fifth century BC, and know more about the Second Sophistic than the First.

Moreover, underlying a number of papers in this volume is recognition of what Henderson describes as “a massive transformation of attitudes to ‘knowledge’ of antiquity within classical studies”—the recognition (“contemporary scepticism”) that, “So large a proportion of our data on the fifth century now appears so thoroughly fragile—precariously transmitted, yes, but also shot through with fictive motivation, creative myth-making and hero-cult...” Surely, the influential and damning judgement of Pseudo-Longinus quoted above—and *would you give the single tragedy of Oedipus for all the works of Ion together?*—is proof positive.

Ion’s particular re-constructions of genealogy and myth, both in prose and poetry, demonstrate how one individual could manipulate “social memory”.⁵³ This kind of manipulation is consistent across Ion’s polyeidetic output, and apprehending this provides another means of access to the mindset of the audience for whom these works were created: indeed it is paramount to any grasp of the Greek literary process itself—Henderson’s “imaginary Greece of the ancient Greek imagination”.

One aim of this volume is to offer original contextualizations through which our sensitivity to Ion, his works and his world can be advanced. Indeed, that *polyeideia* itself emerges from our accounts as rather less

⁵³ Alcock (1996) 243–5, 249.

foreign to the ‘classical’ than anticipated is a consequence of a more ‘spacious’ reading of our fifth century polymath’s world—and within this lies the means to unravel the strategies of self-representation and memorialization in the multiple lives of Ion of Chios.

As Power remarks on the tastes of the élites of Ion’s circle, “it is a sign of their own mastery of the cultural discourse that they can create the rules under which such behaviours are not ‘inconsistent’”. In no way does this volume pretend to present a consistent picture of “Ion” restored to integrity from his scattered fragments. Such a construction would be mere fantasy. Moreover, as Pelling so rightly emphasizes, “One striking feature in what we have of Ion is the absence of an ‘I’ perspective”. ‘Our’ Ion remains tantalizingly flickering and Protean, but we would like to suggest that this in itself is “good” as well as “hard to think with”.

PART ONE

SURVIVAL

CHAPTER TWO

THE HOCUS OF A HEDGEHOG: ION'S VERSATILITY

JOHN HENDERSON

Introduction

His critics actually attacked him for his versatility.
(*CHCL* 1: 568)¹

Perhaps since Hellenistic times, certainly since later Antiquity, the primary mode of existence for Ion of Chios in classical studies has been as an entry within encyclopedic reference guides to ancient Greek culture.² The bulk of the traces we have are from the Roman Empire, but just one mention of a “25th letter in the alphabet”—the naso-palatal sound *ñ* in the pronunciation of Greek and Latin, dubbed “the *agma*”, which however is dignified with no graphic sign of its own—represents the total impact he has left on Latin writing and Roman culture.³ As we shall see, Ion is of interest to just one extant imperial text in Greek with any direct bearing on *Rome*.⁴ In particular, Plutarch is bent on *Hellas* every time he brings him on.

Writing Ion must work away from the encyclopedia entry format, continually touching base with that common point of dispersion, and finally checkable against it as valorizing point of origin. In this essay,

¹ Anthony Bulloch on *Callimachus*. For the record, Ion's listing in *CHCL* (Easterling and Knox 1985) outreaches to: prose, quasi-biographical (p. 8); elegy (p. 137 + a cf. at p. 247); choral lyric, various (p. 242); historical writing, the *Epidemiai* (p. 459; cf. story about Sophocles at p. 296); main bio-entry under tragedy (p. 340).

² *Nachleben*: von Blumenthal (1939) 3–4.

³ The exception is down to indefatigable Varro's hunt for materials towards a historical archaeology of the Latin language. This elementary item had a future, minus Ion: see Leurini (2000a) on 119 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F20 = 36B3a DK = Varro *Ling.* fr. 46 Goetz-Schoell.

⁴ That is, Athenaeus. For Ion on Musaeus in Philodemus *De pietate* (p. 13 Gomperz) see *PHerc* 243 VI 3–12 (= 95* Leurini = 30A West [see West 1983a]): *σεληνο | πετη δ' Ἴων αὐτὸν | λέγει*; for Ion (?) in Schol. Verg. *G.* 1.482, see 123 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F62.

I check out the *prosaics* of the entries we have, starting from cross-comparison between the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and the four chief testimonia on Ion, *Leben und Werke* (T9a, T8, T11, T4 Leurini): viz, Harpocraton;⁵ scholion on Aristophanes *Peace*;⁶ and two entries from the *Suda*, one *sub verbo* διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι,⁷ taken from a scholion on the same passage from that play, and the other *sub nomine*.⁸ Naturally, the packaging of these lemmata into a condensed portrait, or anatomy, of the author calls for proving, by a re-wind through the material we have, and a (necessarily speculative) attempt to assess the lost vantage points that generated the ancient entries.

The irony persists, that the entries made back when, and because, the works were collected, and clamoured for retrieval system, were subsequently shorn of their detail when the catalogue outlived the library—until *our* call for accessible information grew dictionaries where entries that transcribe what once had known where to find what they knew, but are long since reduced to kissing in the wind, mingle unremarkably with entries that deliver what we do (still/now) know, and know where to look for it. Dictionaries.

Reception: Oxford Classical Dictionary

Dictionaries generally trade under collective authorship, often further incorporated by institutional titlature, as in the case of *OCD*.⁹ Modern practice part-acknowledges the editorial function (title page; preface), part-recognizes individual contributions (initials; key listing). But the idiom is de-personal—and (of course) owns no derivation: ancient sources are indicated; modern bibliography may be subjoined; but

⁵ T9a and 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = DK 36A1, B1 = Harpocraton s.v. Ion.

⁶ T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835.

⁷ T11 Leurini = *Suda* s.v. διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι (δ 1029).

⁸ T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* s.v. *Ion Chios* (ι 487).

⁹ I am indebted to Simon Hornblower for compelling and compulsive information on the *OCD*³ project (1990–4 > 1996 publication)—c. 2,000,000 words on 1,640 pages compacting 6,250 entries (c. 900 new) by 364 contributors (from 370 invitations)—and for a pre-view of Hornblower and Spawforth (forthcoming), revealing that OUP New York sought a change of title from *Dictionary* to “a different word, perhaps *Encyclopedia* or *Companion*”: “we were able to resist this pressure for name-change because, we argued truthfully, it came too late... The reason for retaining the name ‘dictionary’ [was] the wish to represent the book as a new version of a trusted work of reference”.

encyclopedic predecessors are unmentionable—even in the many inevitable instances of wholesale transcription, of total dependence.¹⁰ Where (say) the *Real-Encyclopädie*, proves unimpeachable and (more to the point) unimprovable, its successors (not least *Der Neue Pauly*) take silent responsibility for any decision to re-cycle the assessment under the new dateline, pending revision to come.¹¹

In the case of “ION (2), of Chios”, Sir Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge’s shot for the 1949 first edition was in the main allowed to stand by D. W. Lucas in the second (1970).¹² They start with *Leben*: right away, the qualification “of Chios, but equally at home in *Athens*” at once strikes an arresting note, in this minimalist genre of comprehensive reference-work brachylogy, where there is only space to be sure. Here is a “Greek poet”, but—before we categorize his poetry, we have already interrupted the registration of birthplace-plus-dates, and the intervention cues the colour given to the life played out next, between “probably born about 490 BC” and “He died before 421”. For Ion is recommended to us at length as, exactly, an intimate participant-observer in the cynosure of everything Classical, in and out of Oxford:¹³ in fifth century Athens,

¹⁰ Credit for finessing away information that no longer goes anywhere is harder to give—especially in the archival context of machinery for preserving knowledge wholesale. I look forward to the abridged version of *OCD*³.

¹¹ *RE* IX.2 (1916) 1861–8 [Diehl]. “11) *Ion von Chios*” is exhaustive as always. Just one locus on Callimachus, at 1863.21–3, linking “*Ion ἔγραψε πολλὰ*” with the query on the authenticity of *Triagmos*. In *Der Neue Pauly* (1998), “B.Z[immermann]” presents the new listing of “(2) *Ion aus Chios, ca 480–423/2 v. Chr.*”; “*Er ist eine Ausnahmerscheinung unter den Literaten des 5. Jh. da er sich in verschieden Gattungen—sowohl in Prosa wie in der Poesie—betätigte. Kallimachos würdigt in den Iamben ausdrücklich die Vielfalt von I.s Werk...*” True to the *Pinakes*’ principles, the article sequences bios, then opera: [1] verse: tragedy > lyric > elegy; [2] prose: *Triagmos* and *Epidemiai* (“*das erste Memoirenwerk der Lit.-Gesch.*”).

¹² Chris Stray (work in progress: “Sir William Smith and his Dictionaries” and *per litteras*) expertly observes that *OCD*¹ (Editorial Preface) introduced itself as proximal successor to Smith’s world of mid-late Victorian classical dictionaries, citing, for example, the *TLS* review entitled “The new Smith” (2 April 1949, p. 219: by R. W. Chapman, Greek particles, and Macedonia—and...Secretary at *OUP*, 1920–42). In the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (1844–9: 606–7), the four-para entry on “*ΙΩΝ* (Ἴων) 1. of Chios” by P[hilip] S[mith], the younger brother, more than sets the mould for *OCD*: (1) Chasing an opening summary of written output: parentage and life (coming to Athens, hobnobbing with the famous), début tragedy and death, sole victory and wealth. (2) Tragedies: “There are some beautiful passages...”; (3) other verse, “...so universal a writer as Ion...”; (4) prose, with the *Epidemiai* (= *Hypomnemata*? = *Ekdemetikos*?) for finale. The six-item bibliography leads off with young Bentley’s début, the *Epistle to Mill*. (Naturally, there is no mention of Callimachus.)

¹³ In this, the article follows the priorities of the overwhelming *tour de force* from Oxford’s Titan, Felix Jacoby (1947a): see below on *OCD*², and cf. especially Huxley’s “debt to Jacoby’s masterly paper” (1965: 29n1).

along with the best of them—"on friendly terms *with Cimon*, whom he met, *with Themistocles*, at a dinner party in Athens, he heard Cimon speak in the Assembly, whose sociability he contrasted *with* the aloofness of *Pericles*. Anecdotes record his meeting *with Aeschylus* at the Isthmian Games, *with Sophocles* at Chios, and possibly *with Socrates*". Quite a haul, up-close and sustained, across the board of high politics, high drama, and "possibly" the crucible of Western philosophy, through the whole span of that vital half-century between Persian and Peloponnesian Wars—but whose "anecdotes", and how do we mean, "anecdotes"? And "record"?¹⁴—are we to credit (any of) them? "Hobnob, *v. i.* 1 Drink to each other, drink together. 2 Be on familiar terms with; talk informally with" (*OED*). Welcome to Athens as culture club, collegial Classics. And of Ion himself—in his own right? No time to dwell: "He was fond of his wine and other pleasures—the satyric element which, as he said, virtue, no less than *tragedy*, needed to complete it". The name-dropping is done, and, with this the sole quote from Ion that will make the cut, we are already up and away, bridging to his defining activity as poet. A glide from sympotic life to satyric literature: "His first appearance as a *tragic* poet was about 451 BC; in 428 he was defeated by *Euripides* . . . , but on another occasion he won the first prize *at the Great Dionysia* for both *tragedy and dithyramb*, and in his delight made a present of Chian wine to every Athenian citizen".

Ion has now joined Tragedy's big three; and, though mention of it is out as well as *infra dig*, he has emerged as a(n unappreciated) player in all the life-projects of A.W.P.-C. (1873–1952): *Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (1953),¹⁵ *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy* ((1927)¹⁶ and—possibly—(1900) the *Comic Greek Fragments, Edited*). This will prove to be the entry's only mention of dithyramb, but with Chios, wine, and the *demos* (sc. of democratic) Athens, an inspiring Dionysiac existence is played out,

¹⁴ "Possibly" betokens, more than reluctance to credit Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Socrates* (111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23), steadfastness under heavy fire from Jacoby (1947a) 9–11, "3. Sokrates in Ion's Epidemiai", at p. 10, "we are in duty bound to decide between them [Plato and Ion] instead of trying to get rid of Ion or to smooth over the contradictory statements... It cannot really be doubted that we have to believe Ion"; and at p. 11, "We cannot decide with confidence between these two possibilities, but that does not lessen the value of Ion's testimony for the fact that Sokrates in his youth had been a follower of Archelaos". *Some remarks* . . .

¹⁵ Posthumously seen through the Clarendon Press by T. B. L. Webster (1968²: revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis); and still no role for Ion.

¹⁶ Just a cold paragraph on Ion (p. 46 = 1962²: 30, revised by T. B. L. Webster).

and we blur from "first appearance", through a *defeat*, to his *win(e)*, into the celebration of the *Werke*.

This is, first and foremost, a Greek *tragic* poet, says the file; and catalogued as such: "The number of his plays... The known titles..." The output is "variously given"—if a dozen, then the list *we* are given must "include" all but one; if the upper figure of "40", then not only are our "fragments... few and insignificant", but our direct grasp of the corpus evanescent: "the Heraclean cycle", featuring "the *satyric Omphale*", and "the Trojan", others, and one "title unparalleled for a Greek tragedy". We therefore depend on ancient estimates of his work, and these demand full reportage: "The Alexandrian critics...; Aristarchus and Didymus..., and Baton... In the treatise *On the Sublime*..." The list declines from Ion's admission "to the *Canon*—their select list of outstanding *tragic* poets", through bare notice of "commentaries on his *plays*" and then "a" non-committal "monograph on *him*", to reach his *Sublime* evaluation "as a faultless and perfectly finished *writer* in the 'smooth style', but without the force and fire of *Pindar and Sophocles*". With this extension of scope beyond tragic drama, and concomitant descent from "outstanding" to "without the force and fire" of the big names, we are ready to widen the viewfinder to match the complete scope of Ion's total output.

'The rest' are formally marked down as sub-category adjuncts: "In addition to his tragedies..." And their procession genre by genre presents as a dutiful parade colluding with its implicit hint that we aren't missing much by rapid-fire scrolling past all this undifferentiated voluminousness: "elegiac poems, epigrams, encomia, paeans, hymns, scolia, possibly a comedy, at least one cosmological work in prose, a history of the foundation of Chios..., and memoirs". No comment on the half-dozen verse types, not even whether it survives; and only that impassive "possibly" to modify the otherwise remarkable prospect of a fifth century scriptwriter who managed uniquely to produce both tragedy and comedy.

For dear Donald Lucas in 1970 (1905–85, editor of Aristotle *Poetics* (1968); former translator of Euripides *Ion*, director/producer of Aristophanes *Frogs* for the Cambridge Greek play, and author of *The Greek Tragic Poets*), that "philosophical work in prose" called for specification: "the *Τριαγμός*, in which he showed on Pythagorean principles the triadic structure of the cosmos". In 1949 "ION (2)" had tailed off steeply, as a final batch of prose works enforced a straggling series of unsatisfying note-form and bracketed dubieties:

...and memoirs (*perhaps* of several kinds) in which there were personal reminiscences of a number of famous men. (The exact meaning of the titles Ἐπιδημίαι and Συνεκδημητικός is *uncertain*. The former *may have* given an account of the visits of distinguished persons to Chios, as Bentley suggested, or of his own travels; the latter *may have* been a ‘travelling companion’. The title Ὑπομνήματα *probably* covers both: cf. Ath. 13. 603, schol. Ar. Pax 835, Pollux 2. 88, etc.)||

Without ditching the incertitude, 1970 saw this turned around, as the entire listing flips about from dispiriting fade-out to enthusiastically acclaimed climax. Launching from the topos already adumbrated in this prose section, of reception and utilization (“a history of the foundation of Chios (of which Pausanias 7. 4. 8 made use)”), Lucas fashions caesura between ancient privilege and our modern predicament—and predilection:

...and memoirs. These last are *to us the most interesting of his works*, especially on account of the long quotation given by Athenaeus 605 e in which he describes *with lively detail* an evening spent by Sophocles in Chios. *No other Greek before Socrates is presented so vividly*. The title Ἐπιδημίαι probably refers to the visits of distinguished characters to the island. Whether it is identical with the Συνεκδημητικός Pollux 2. 88 and the Ὑπομνήματα schol. Ar. Pax 835 is uncertain. Ion appears to have had *no imitators in the genre that he had invented*. ||

Lucas has taken to heart George Huxley’s “paper read to Hibernian Hellenists at Ballymascanlon, Dundalk”: “In his *Epidemiai* or “Visits”, the earliest example in Greek literature of *memoirs*, a *genre* which *Ion* may have *invented*...”¹⁷ He takes but one extra line of copy to pull this off (obeying the iron law of second edition parsimony, as well as the encyclopedic muse), but contrives a fresh and tidily composed ring-structure that feeds back to the opening *Leben* by spelling out a couple of those “distinguished characters” by name.

The pair of (tragic) *Sophocles* (who can stand for statesmen and tragedians both) and (philosopher) *Socrates* (blatantly but deftly smuggled into the prose) transport us back where Ion came in, “of Chios, but equally at home in Athens”. Now we can have an inkling, too, that we have learned so little about the corpus because if “fragments are few and insignificant” for the tragedies, they are far fewer yet, and (so) less capable of “interesting” *us*, for the rest of the poems and prose. Those

¹⁷ Huxley (1965) 29n1, 31; cf. p. 35: “Ion, like some Irishmen, knew that admiration for a powerful neighbour is consistent with local patriotism”.

"anecdotes" must survive as re-told, from Ion's pages, with the precious exception of the "especially...long quotation given by Athenaeus". Conceivably we are now emboldened to gather that Cimon & co., and Aeschylus, too, must be mediated to us through Plutarch (as cited), and presume that the earlier reference to "Sophocles at Chios in 441–440 when the latter was a general in the Samian War (Ath. 13. 603 e)" extends on into the final acclamation of said *long quotation describing that evening spent by φιλομεῖραξ Sophocles in Chios*.¹⁸

The way we know about Ion's life turns out to be that we can read, mostly at second-hand, stories *he* put together about hobnobbing with the celebs. Where *OCD*¹ gave us a chum knocking about with the great and good in stories that got *recorded*, and producing the odd *bon mot* celebrating wine, Athens, and company, *OCD*² ushers in a creative original born before his time, tantalizing *inventor* of a "genre" of in-crowd book-culture concerning the intelligentsia.¹⁹ In profiling the social scene of the glitterati, our "lively" roving reporter-cum-genial fellow-traveller-cum-welcoming party-cum-favoured ally/incorporated subject "so vividly" brought to life a unique authoriality that far outstrips that prolifically uninteresting poet's weird bid to rival Pythagoras' theorem in conceiving a triplicate universe—let alone that *faultlessly 'smooth' writer of canonical but also-ran tragedy (and lyric)*, around whom the listing is (still and all) framed.

It's not hard to spot. This internal tension left the next quarter-century stuck with an Ion in need of a make-over. A.L.B. (Andrew Brown, editor of Sophocles *Antigone*, and scenography nut) in 1996 duly delivered a re-write, in conformity with the changed formatting (and function) devised for *OCD*³.²⁰ The bulk of the listing is all gathered under the single, formalized, head: "Works". The single most striking innovation in the entry, however, comes at the outset, in the first paragraph summarizing the *Leben*:

¹⁸ Sadly, the 1970 reference is a mere slip for "13. [the book sub-titled Περὶ γυναικῶν] 603 e", as earlier.

¹⁹ Taking up the challenge (bull-by-horns, as ever), Sir Kenneth Dover (1986: 34–7) asks, "How original a concept of prose literature is reflected in the *Epidemiai*?" [1] "Stesimbrotus' assemblage of...anecdotes can have preceded and inspired the...memoirs of Ion,...[but] that would not wholly detract from the originality of Ion...[2] I propose that Ion's *Epidemiai* should be given a place in the genealogy of the dialogues of Plato...[P]lanting the seed from which the Platonic dialogue grew".

²⁰ Simon Hornblower (personal communication) records Brown "as a very useful contributor"—delivering brand-new entries on a number of important topics, such as Oedipus.

Ion (2) of Chios, *an unusually versatile poet and prose author*, seems to have been born in the 480s BC and to have come to Athens about 466. He was dead by 421, when Aristophanes (1) paid a graceful tribute to him at *Peace* 834–7.

Versatility *may* have been implicit in the displaced version, and conceivably attached to both catalogued verse and itemized prose, as well as to their authorship by the same writer; but now this dominant keynote runs through—constitutes, even—the whole entry (*as a whole*). Provides us with the best binding around, for holding his works together as the productivity of one career.

We learn that the “Works included the following:”, and there *may* (just) be sufficiently systematic notice given to vestigial survival through the roll-call of categories of writing to intimate that Ion’s “Works” verge on being a dead loss ‘to us’.²¹ Tragedy (still) bosses the bibliography, which is formally enumerated, classification after classification:²²

(1) Tragedies and satyr-plays. *The Suda* says that Ion wrote 12 or 30 or 40 plays... He was defeated..., but on another occasion *he is said* to have won first prize in both dithyramb and tragedy and to have made a present of Chian wine to every Athenian citizen... We have some eleven titles and some brief fragments... (2) Lyric poetry. This included dithyrambs, encomia, paeans, and hymns. (3) Elegiac poetry. This mainly consisted of drinking-songs, *to judge from the surviving fragments*. *One song was apparently written for...* Archidamus II, king of Sparta. (4) *Perhaps comedies, but these rest only on one doubtful source*. (5) The *Triagmos*, a philosophical work, in prose... (6) A *Foundation of Chios*, probably in prose. (7) *Epidemiai* or *Visits*, a book of reminiscences, in prose. This recounted Ion’s meetings with, and impressions of, great men of his day, and *was perhaps* his most original work, and the most interesting to us. *Surviving fragments* describe meetings with Cimon, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, all of whom Ion admired (the conversation of Sophocles at a symposium on Chios is the subject of a long extract). Also mentioned, but not necessarily known to him in person, were Themistocles, Pericles (1) (whom Ion disliked), Archelaus (1), and Socrates. |

²¹ How weird *is* it that our dictionaries won’t tell us where they ghost-write ghost items we can only find between their covers? Do we users enjoy the tease—and hope we find out when we’re missing out on pleasures we *can* have?

²² The chiasmus is stark: *OCD*¹ ~ “*biograph*” von Blumenthal (1939): [1] *Epidemiai* > *Chios* > *Triagmos*; [2] elegies > lyrics > dithyrambs > encomium > hymn > tragedies; [3] *Synekdemetikos* > dubia :: *OCD*³ ~ “Callimachean” Leurini [2000a]: [1] tragedies > dithyrambs > lyrics > hymns > encomia > elegy + [2] *Chios* > *Epidemiai* > *Synekdemetikos* > *Triagmos* > etc. > dubia.

The category "Lyric" now sweeps up just four sub-categories (exit "epigrams" and "scolia"; enter "dithyrambs"), and relegates "elegiac poems" to (3). Still placed last among the poems, away from tragic drama, presumably because of their/its dubious existence: (4) "Perhaps comedies...", ousting "possibly a comedy". Philosophy now bosses the run of prose works, at (5); with the *Foundation* at (6), probably because the finale of *Epidemicai* still makes for a gripping climax to the article, while not claiming any elevated status for the book—"perhaps his most original", that is, *sui generis*. The claim to be the work "most interesting to us" is now substantiated by the carefully qualified, differentiated, and extended detailing of seven named big wheels—all of whom can, next, now "ION" is through, be chased up through their own entries (sign-posted by relentlessly rigorous asterisking). In line with fresh thinking, the profile we get smoothly melds together a wealth and breadth of likely scenarios, so as not to impose too hard and fast a line: "reminiscences", "recounted...meetings with, and impressions of", "describe meetings with", "conversation...at a symposium", "mentioned, but not necessarily known to him in person". And, for our less adulatory age, enthusiasm for graphic writing yields, and (critically correct?) 'balance' is imported: "all of whom Ion admired" ~ "whom Ion disliked"!²³

Continuities insist—including a measure of transcribed phraseology—but it is evident that this Ion for the twenty-first century has changed incarnation in two main ways since his *OCD* premiere (1933–49). We still recognize this writer as pre-eminently a (second-rate?) tragedian: "admitted by later critics into a canon of five great tragedians. 'Longinus' (*Subl.* 33) found his plays faultless and elegant but sadly lacking in the inspired boldness of Sophocles (1)". But he is now, before all, a "versatile...author", and this re-coding invites a totalizing approach to his combination as well as his volume of productivity.²⁴ And Ion's most original work—in prose—amounted to a review of (an extensive pantheon of) the celebs and history-makers we too would most like to 'meet' from the improvisational era when those Athenians invented classical civilization; maybe he "seems to have come to Athens about

²³ This *after* Huxley (1965) 34–5: "of Pericles, however, Ion was outspokenly critical... The words are definitely hostile... Jacoby insists that Ion's *dislike* of Pericles the man does not mean that he hated Periclean home or foreign policy, but I feel less confident".

²⁴ In reaction, West (1985) 71: "But Ion claims our attention *not just as a versatile* and moderately successful literary man..."

466", but the point is not the life he lived, but the gallery of portraits he penned.

This second re-orientation represents, not just delayed liberation from (the noted Balliol entomologist) Pickard-Cambridge's hobby horses, but a massive transformation of attitudes to 'knowledge' of antiquity within classical studies since his day. So large a proportion of our data on the fifth century now appears so thoroughly fragile—precariously transmitted, yes, but also shot through with fictive motivation, creative myth-making and hero-cult... Yet, by the same token, contemporary scepticism embraces the history of ancient culture as it now re-centres around the historical reality of ancient lore, revisionary theorization, and identity-formation through allegiance—the imaginary Greece of the ancient Greek imagination.²⁵

We can get an idea of what Ion came to mean, the role of his writings in shaping ideas of what classical Greece meant to some Greek reader-writers and encyclopedists, and (yes, still) an inkling or two of what it might have been (like) to swan around the Aegean, and write like fury. Invocation of "ION (2), of Chios", now counts for a loud signal that fiction got going before (the) fact. A 'Cimon' was written into fame, not just attested as famous—textualized all the way up, from ostracism to hagiographic consecration. And to meet Sophocles was to respond to his aura, and buy into the spin: the fifth century was no pre-literate rumour mill—it had its *journalist*, the presumption that an Ion would be there, he *must* have been, how else could these textual heroes head book culture into a future that could idolize each precious word? The story, and the story about the story, boundaried the consignment of writing from within the originary classicizing moment of these living legends' own day.

But the impetus for the first shift in our Ion *relates to* a more specific circumstantiality. No doubt we have become more open to idiosyncratic hybridity and experimental heterodoxy within our configuration of classical authoriality, and more flexible in our attitudes to documented ancient opinion, canon formation, and hierarchization. Why *wouldn't* we doubt that plays that won prizes would for that reason make 'better' bearers of Athenian mentality than those they trounced? Without a

²⁵ I *am* thinking of Buxton (1994), but also of the epistemic drive motivating his theme of "the distance and interplay between the imaginary world of the stories and the (real?) world of the tellers" (p. 5).

doubt, we have become so attuned to the power of generic proprieties to frame textual meaning that we *need* the iconoclastic potential of a pen positioned before the mentality of the category put up its fencing.²⁶ Why *shouldn't* we dream on the free-ranging maverick? There, all along? Sure, this book of essays flirts with all that. But, you know, it was the post-war publication and scholarly reception of a tattered, papyrus-borne, ancient commentary on Callimachus' *Thirteenth Iamb* that changed Ion's pickle for good—and floated this collection. I shall return to this development after reviewing those ancient Greek testimonia. For the moment, I must just emphasise that the reference has gone unremarked by *OCD*³ (it really should have impacted already on the *OCD*² entry). And our fullest ancient listings for Ion *did* signal the Callimachus passage, all along...

Refraction: Callimachus' Iambi and Pinakes

Most of what we know of Ion we owe directly to a combination of notes in ancient commentary compilations on two or three citations in ancient Greek texts with a couple of extant ancient encyclopedic entries for him. There is contamination between these two streams of material, and (make no mistake) since 1947 it has been a generally held axiom that the core fund of data derives from, and owes what cohesion it has, to a single prestigious library catalogue entry from the height of early second century BC Ptolemaic civilization. Agreeably enough, the original formatting that programmes all such author profiles from that day to this, traces to the very same Callimachus, poet and scholar of the court, library and museum at Alexandria (Jacoby 1947a: 15, "Appendix 1", q.v.):

So far as I know it has never been recognized that the three testimonies on the writer Ion... all derive ultimately from the Πίνakes of Kallimachos. They reached the Lexica and the Scholia by separate ways, and that is why they supplement each other.

²⁶ Rossi (1971) made a critical intervention in clarifying the crucial 'inbetweenness' of Greek genre, in the tug-of-war pragmatics of prescriptive and improvisatory frames for signification.

Not a word of this in the *OCD*, but explicit mention of this source, ultimately responsible for launching all later listings for Ion, does survive—paraded, indeed—in our documents: T9a, 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = DK 36A1, B1 = Harpocraton s.v. Ion.²⁷

This is an entry in the second century AD *Lexeis of the Ten Orators*, by Harpocraton of Alexandria, occasioned by mention of Ion as the cosmologist of triangulation in a flourish of dogma by the eighty-two years young fourth century Isocrates, pontificating away on a fictitious capital charge of evading his civic duty. This doyen of debate as educational programme is explaining that the Liberal Arts course makes a worthy preliminary to more advanced studies—but the time soon comes when the juggling tricks of the “sophists of old” pay diminishing returns, and they should be left to their cogitations—“some positing innumerable existents, Empedocles just four elements, Ion no more than three, Alcmaeon two, Parmenides and Melissus one, and (going, going,) Gorgias...none at all”! The sixth century AD commentary on the Aristotelian *De Generatione et Corruptione* by Philoponus (still) knew the place of Ion—“the tragedian”—within this doxology (115* (I) Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F24c = 36A6 DK [second text] = Philop. *De gen. et corr.*, p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli), but this Isocratean²⁸ banter underlines Harry Sandbach’s caveat about the *Triagmos* (1958–9): “Was it serious or a *tour de force*? Is the very title a pun...? We do not know and should be cautious”.

Harpocraton’s note on the citation of Ion reads as a customized adaptation of a post-Callimachean catalogue entry.²⁹ Indeed, as one of the most faithful entries we have—always supposing that the best efforts to distil a standard, or ideal, paradigm for the Callimachean *Pinakes* are less than a chimera of modern scholarship! Superimposing the half-dozen most detailed testimonia we have for items once entered into the 120 books of that vast catalogue suggests that authors were meant to divide into classes, and sub-classes, within which entries were alphabetized (initial letter only). Poets first, probably epic first,

²⁷ Huxley (1965) 39n48 inserts an unspecified reservation: “(perhaps from the *Pinakes* of Callimachus)”.

²⁸ 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F24b = 36A6 [first text] = Isoc. *Antid.* 268.

²⁹ The account that follows re-hashes Blum (1991) 150–60, “4.4 His Lists of Greek Authors and Their Works”. He is wary of hagiographic over-egging (“Less conscientious, even sensational, the vast biographical work of Hermippus of Smyrna...[W]e may doubt if his master Callimachus liked it; he had confined himself to the reliable evidence for the lives and works of literary men...”, purrs Pfeiffer 1968: 129).

on prestige, and then a run-down through varieties of lyric, before the call for dramatists, first tragic, and then comic. Prose would subdivide between history, philosophy, oratory, law-codes, and (presumably) astronomy, geometry, medicine; finally, 'Miscellaneous' authors sorted books by subject-matter—cook-books, cake-making, etc. If there *were* one, a uniformat would require: name, then biographical data, titles of works sorted into sets by type, with the opening words of each work, plus the guestimated number of standard-length lines required for a copy. Writers who produced texts in different categories (such as Callimachus) would be awarded their main entry within the class of writings listed first in the biographical sketch, and sub-entries under any headings that followed therein.

Thus, transposing the data presented in *OCD* back into the Alexandrian scheme would *introduce* Ion as (principally) a tragic poet, and then list him as melic-elegiac (and †comic†) writer; after that, run through his prose genres: history, philosophy, notes. The main entry would continue with a list of lyric poems by sub-group—dithyrambs, encomia, paeans, hymns, scolia, elegiacs, †epigrams†, each with its *incipit* and line-count. In the tragic catalogue, a perfect entry should refer back to lyric, before listing and profiling the tragedies. So for the comedy, if any; and on to the prose works... This is, to be sure, how Harpocraton's note sets about Ion. With one all too likely kink:

T9a Leurini (= Harpocraton s.v. Ion): (i)

Ἴων· Ἰσοκράτης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως. Ἴωνος τοῦ τῆς τραγωδίας ποιητοῦ μνημονεύοι ἂν νῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὅς ἦν...

Ion. Isocrates in *On the Tax Swap*. The wordsmith's mention here will be of the tragedy poet, who was...

When Ion is given an epithet in order to distinguish him from other bearers of his (absurdly, mythically, multi-occupation) name, he is "the poet", or more specifically, as here, "the tragic poet". If *I* were playing Alexandrian catalogue, I would introduce him first among melic poets, but signal *ahead* there to his main entry, to be found under tragic poets, where he would be re-introduced in the significant order of "tragedian, then melic poet, then †comedian†, & c.". Harpocraton's listing, however, will tell against my deviation (iii, below):

T9a Leurini: (ii)

Χίως μὲν γένος, υἱὸς δὲ Ὀρθομένους, ἐπὶ κλησιν δὲ Ξούθου.

from a family of Chios, son of Orthomenes-aka-Xuthus.

A perfect formulaic start, from family hometown + filiation, with a flourish thrown in. (Was Ion nicknamed “son of Xuthus” to smile/josh/mess with father/son for the mythical pretensions in naming the boy for the prince through whom Ion-ians traced their affiliation to Athens? Or had Orthomenes been dubbed Xuthus, then named his son accordingly?)³⁰

T9a Leurini: (iii)

ἔγραψε δὲ μέλη πολλὰ καὶ τραγωδίας καὶ φιλόσοφόν τι σύγγραμμα τὸν
Τριαγμὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον,

Wrote: lyrics a-plenty; tragedies; a philosophy tract under the title *Tri-
angulation*,

A bare outline set of classificatory pointers ahead—‘asterisks’? Certainly the formula ἔγραψε δὲ πολλὰ summarizes—finesses specification of—the output of countless author entries in the ancient Greek encyclopedia summaries. Note, at any rate: *first* melic, *then* tragic. And so, without ado, to (prose, and) the genre in point for Isocrates and Harpocration: philosophy, and instant focus on the work which the citation had drawn upon. By title.

T9a Leurini: (iv: see on 116 Leurini, below)

ὅπερ Καλλίμαχος ἀντιλέγεσθαι φησιν ὡς Ἐπιγένους.

that Callimachus says is claimed for Epigenes’.

“Callimachus”, we are bound to guess, here = the *Pinakes* tradition. It appears that a multiply-bungled account has garbled a report that Ion’s cosmology featured Pythagoras ascribing some rehearsed lines to Orpheus into a bogus claim of authorship for Epigenes—read in from the next item in (what at any rate became) someone’s Orpheus-Pythagoras saga, viz: “... Epigenes in his book *On the Teachings Attributed to Orpheus*, says that the *Katabasis* and *Sacred Discourse* were the work of Cecrops the Pythagorean... etc., etc.” (116(I) Leurini = 36B2 DK [second text] = Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.131; from the chapter *Judaic Institutions and Laws of Far Higher Antiquity than the Philosophy of Hellenism*).³¹ (The same?) Epigenes, coeval with Callimachus, is reported as interpreting a

³⁰ Cf. Jacoby (1947a) 1n7, and see below.

³¹ Pfeiffer (1949) 347–8 (note on Callimachus fr. 449 = T22a, T24 [=T9a] Leurini), however, reckons (*ni fallor*) that Epigenes did write about Ion, following Callimachus in observing that there was a dispute about the *Triangmos*.

passage from Ion's tragedy, *Agamemnon* (1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468c). Of course, the commentator must take the nuisance of tainted authenticity in his stride, and revel in all the scholarly hubbub, because cosmology is Ion's pertinence to the Isocratean citation. His *Triangulation* makes it into this profile, and no other. Callimachus' intervention, or no—and the rest.³²

T9a Leurini: (v)

ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ πληθυντικῶς ἐπιγράφεται Τριαγμοί, καθὰ Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος καὶ Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεὺς ἀναγράφουσι.

In several writers it goes under the title in the plural, *Triangulations*, by the listings of Demetrius of Scepsis and Apollonides of Nicaea.

The plural variant resumes the topic of titlature for the work being researched. This view of the second century BC polymath Demetrius—who wrote sixty books on the sixty lines of the *Iliad*'s catalogue (—of ships)—and of the first century AD commentator Apollonides is borne out by witnesses to the material concerned with Ion's Pythagoras/Orpheus (116 Leurini, above). von Blumenthal (1939) 3–4/Leurini (2000a) 8–10 assemble a grand tally of ancient commentary and critical work on Ion, notably: “Baton of Sinope's [late third century BC] monograph on *Ion the Poet: The Facts* which cited Ion's elegiac poetry for avowals of tipping and desire for . . . Goldie of Corinth—Pericles' alleged turn-on” (T13 Leurini = Ath. 436f); plus commentary on locution(s), if not work(s) from Ion, especially by the great second century BC critic and Alexandrian librarian Aristarchus (T26 Leurini = Ath. 634c), and, above all, the first century BC phenomenon Didymus ‘the Chalcenic’, who produced *Refutations (of Aristarchus) on Ion* (T31b Leurini = Ath. 634e: on the satyric *Omphale*), plus a dedicated exegesis of Ion's *Agamemnon* (T31a Leurini = Ath. 468d, see above)—almost inevitably, given the extraordinary profusion of commentary work he lavished on practically every Greek author, among the three or four thousand books the legend says he wrote till he forgot what was in them. Since Didymus put together many of the scholia which found and fill our tragic, lyric and (especially) *Aristophanes* scholia, we may do well to identify him as the kingpin to link together our twin stock of entries for Ion?

³² The *Triagmos* does not make it into Athenaeus (unlike boozing from the *Chios*: 99 Leurini = *FGH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e).

T9a Leurini: (vi = 114 Leurini)

...δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τάδε· ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου· πάντα τρία καὶ † πλέον τ' οὐδὲν πλέον ἐλάσσων † τούτων τῶν τριῶν. ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἀρετὴ τριάς· σύνεσις καὶ κράτος καὶ τύχη.

...] in it, as follows: “My topic’s first principle states: all things are threes, and †morenomorelessern† than these threes. Each thing’s full realization is a triad: theorization / effectuality / instantiation”.

However mauled in transmission,³³ here is an ‘opening lines’ lemma to beat all—the self-declared proclamation of the ‘order-to-commence’. Three at a time, but played exactly by the book.

Our second, tri-partite, ancient testimonium takes the form, precisely, of commentary notes (T8, T11 Leurini) on Aristophanes (T7 Leurini). At *Peace* 829, our sky-trekking hero says No, he saw nobody travelling around up there—except maybe two or three souls belonging to D.O.D’s (directors-of-dithyramb). Yes, he continues, it’s true what they say, we do become stars once someone dies, and one there right now is Ion of Chios, who once, ages back, put the dawnly star into poetry; the minute he arrived, one and all called *him* by the name “Dawnly Star”. Notes on the nonce word διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι (T11 Leurini = *Suda* δ 1029) and on Ἴων ὁ Χίος (T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835) have produced specially tweaked revamps of ‘the’ encyclopedic listing for Ion, and there has been contamination both ways between the two genres, while the form of the listing for Ion that has reached us in the (tenth century) *Suda sub nomine* (T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* ι 487: via (fifth century) Hesychius?) adds material from the *Peace* scholia, etc., to otherwise missing information formatted in authentic ‘Callimachean’ style.³⁴ First, the entry for the precious (?) gloss on this (not specially comic) classic Attic ὕπαξ.³⁵

³³ See Baltussen in this volume for another text.

³⁴ See Marzullo (1994). T10 Leurini = *Suda* ι 489 (= Photius ι 287) gives the minimal entry: “Ion. Poet of tragedy. Family Chian” (traceable to Harpocration?). The *Suda* seethes with polyeidic projects and ruins, casts the shadows of a millennium: these thousands of pages teem with emperors Roman and Byzantine, heretics and swine like Epicurus and Lucian, with abomination of eunuchs, diverse doctrines on cosmos, senses, mind, change, voice and light, Hebrew patriarchs in droves and Biblical heroes likewise (Lot, Ezra...), huge dilations on Homer, on Christ, Adam, Origen, Hypatia, and on Pythagoras, a rack of tropes and glosses, proper names and comic neologisms, even a letter of Anastasia the Martyr, *To Chrysogonus*, “and many heterologies”.

³⁵ Compounds with *dithyrambo-* are fun-free in Aristotle, Diodorus and Plutarch.

T11 Leurini (= Suda [δ 1029] s.v. διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι): (i)

περὶ μετεώρων καὶ περὶ τῶν νεφελῶν λέγουσι πολλὰ καὶ συνθέτους δὲ
λέξεις ἐποιοῦν καὶ ἔλεγον ἐνδιαεριαιερινηχέτους.³⁶ οἷος ἦν

On stratospherics, on clouds, they throw in the lexikon—they'd make
up compound terms and say "daytimaeribreezaeryswimmerish". One
such was

Once removed from servicing Aristophanes' readers, and gathered into
the ancient 'classical dictionary' as a lexicographer's gem, the note
inverts, as the cued *dithurambo-* compound yields to the *iondomitable*
composite it signals, of dithyrambic "swimming-in-noontime-airy-
breezesque".

T11 Leurini: (ii)

Ἴων ὁ Χίος, ὁ ποιητής· ἐποίησε δὲ ποίημα, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· Ἀοῖον ἀεροφοίταν
ἀστέρα | μείναμεν ἀελίου λευκοπτέρυγα πρόδρομον. (84 Leurini = 745
PMG = Ar. Pax 835) παίζων δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀοῖον αὐτὸν ἀστέρα φησὶ
κληθῆναι.

Ion of Chios, the poet: composed a poem, starting: "Dawn's aeronaut
star | do we await, sun's whitewing outrider". For fun Aristophanes says
"the guy was called *Dawn's Star*".

Neither melic nor tragic, just 'poet poeticking poem', we observe. But
a commentator's and bio-bibliographer's dream in one, this brief *incipit*
that also nails the original text behind our parody. If it did not stem
from the *Pinakes*, it deserved a second home there.

T11 Leurini: (iii)

περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο· ἔγραψε δὲ κωμῳδίαν καὶ ἐπιγράμματα·

He got to be a celeb.: wrote comedy + epigrams;

After lyric, *a comedy*—in a note *on* comedy. Suspect, but these *epigrams*
(an orphan, we shall see, caused by abbreviating a longer list of verse
genres) are in the 'correct' place for an ideal 'Callimachean' entry, just
before

T11 Leurini: (iv)

καταλογάδην καὶ Πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον.

in prose, add the title *The Ambassador*.

³⁶ Here is *the* comic flight of word fantasy in the passage (*Peace* 831).

One token prose entry, left in diplomatic isolation: this *is* (was) a note on the jet-set of dithyrambic verse.

T11 Leurini: (v)

καὶ Σωκράτους τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐστὶ λόγος εἰς αὐτόν.

Plus, there's a Socrates, yes the philosopher, Dialogue with him.

Not from our classical directory of penmen. How long did this accident wait to happen? Plato's *Ion* was from Ephesus. (He has no more business here than Lucas' Socrates!)

T11 Leurini: (vi)

καὶ Καλλιμάχος ἐν Χωλιάμβοις μέμνηται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι πολλὰ ἔγραψε.

Plus Callimachus mentions him in the *Choliambi* as a prolific writer.

Not from our dictionary! But in this jejune, formulaic note lurked the potential for *Ion* to piggy-back on twentieth century reflation of Callimachus *the poet*.

The Aristophanic scholion that transcribes *Ion*'s profile is a *tour de force*, palpably winding full display of data into maximum pertinence to the *locus*, yet (ultimately) including every last drop of accreted annotation:

T8 Leurini (= Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835): (i)

Ἴων ὁ Χίος· διθυράμβων ποιητὴς καὶ τραγωδίας καὶ μελῶν.

Ion of Chios: dithyramb poet + tragedy + lyrics.

This *poet* must be dithyrambic first; but tragedy *before* lyric best suits our ideal *Pinakes* format for a main first entry.

T8 Leurini: (ii) ~ T11 Leurini: (ii)

ἐποίησε δὲ ὥδην, ἧς ἡ ἀρχή· Ἀοῖον ἀεροφοῖταν ἀστέρα | μείναμεν
ἀελίου λευκοπτέρυγα πρόδρομον. (84 Leurini = 745 *PMG* = Ar. *Pax* 835)
φαίνεται δὲ τετελευτηκῶς ἐκ τούτων. παίζων οὖν ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀοῖον
αὐτὸν ἀστέρα φησὶ κληθῆναι.

Composed a song starting: "Dawn's aeronaut star | do we await, sun's whitewing outrider". Evidently deceased from what follows: "for fun Aristophanes says 'the guy *was* called *Dawn's Star*'".

Two words with *poie-* in a row is quite enough for *this* stylish text, which does *not* miss the importance of the *locus* as fixing an obit for *Ion*.

T8 Leurini: (iii) ~ T11 Leurini: (iii)

περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο· ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ κωμωδίας καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καὶ
παίανας καὶ ὕμνους καὶ σκολιὰ καὶ ἐγκώμια καὶ ἐλεγεία,

He got to be a celeb.: wrote comedy + epigrams + cockahoop chants +
hymns + drinking songs + tributes + elegies;

Comedies, plural; and here is the full litany of melic-elegiac exploits
fated to dominate Ion's entry in all classical dictionaries from Alexan-
dria to us, regardless of survival/loss. (Contrast *OCD*³: (2) *Lyric poetry*.
This included dithyrambs, encomia, paeans, and hymns > (3) *Elegiac poetry* >
(4) *Perhaps comedies*.)

T8 Leurini: (iv) ~ T11 Leurini: (iv)

καὶ καταλογάδην τὸν Πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον, ὃν νόθον ἀξιούσιν εἶναί
τινες καὶ οὐχὶ αὐτοῦ. φέρεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ Κτίσις καὶ Κοσμολογικὸς
καὶ Ὑπομνήματα καὶ ἄλλα τινά.

in prose, add the title *The Ambassador*, which some rate as spurious, *not*
his work. Circulated as his, too, *Foundation*, *The One with the Universe*,
Memoirs etc.

Onto prose now, and (scrupulous?) academic doubts about authenticity
dominate the list. Does Ion as philosopher, subject of his own suspicions,
get buried in this 'etc.'—or are the last pair what others called *Triag-*
mos and *Epidemiai*? 'History > philosophy > other', as in our preferred
schema for *Pinakes*. (Contrast *OCD*³: (5) *Triagmos* > (6) *Foundation of*
Chios > (7) *Epidemiai*.)³⁷

T8 Leurini: (v)

καὶ πάννυ δόκιμος ἦν. φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν ὁμοῦ διθύραμβον καὶ τραγωδίαν
ἀγωνισάμενον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ νικῆσαι, καὶ εὐνοίας χάριν προῖκα Χίον
οἶνον πέμψαι Ἀθηναίους.

³⁷ Prose, "following the order observed by Kallimachos in listing the works of an
author active in several spheres of literature": Jacoby (1947a) 4n6. Without this iden-
tification of *Hypomnemata* with *Epidemiai* (p. 15), Ion's most original and, to us, most
interesting work perishes from his listing. *Epidemiai* are so named only in Schol. Aesch.
Persae 432 = 101 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F7 and Athenaeus: 103 Leurini (n.b.) = *FGrH*
392 F4 = Ath. 93a; 102 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F5 = Ath. 107a; 104 Leurini = *FGrH*
392 F6 = Ath. 603c, note ἐπιγραφόμεναις; cf. 100 Leurini = Iohan. Alex. *Comm. in*
Hippoc. Epid. 6, part. 1.120a69–b2 (see Rose 1871), and -dem- in 111* Leurini = *FGrH*
392 F9 = D. L. 2.23). For -mnemon- cf. 107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = Plut. *Cim.*
16.8–10 and 103 Leurini (as above).

Plus he was really famous. So the story goes, he competed simultaneously and won at dithyramb and tragedy in Attica, and—the feel-good factor—sent the Athenians a present of Chian wine.

We leave bibliometry at this point, for anecdote. *This* version feels like a ‘write up’, a second barrel for the library card’s formula περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο above, taken at the leisurely pace of an expansive commentary, rather than compacted booklist (ἀγωνισάμενον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ νικῆσαι involves double redundancy; εὐνοίας χάριν προῖκα is idle verbal gloss). Is the (incredible?) double victory here in order to bind the story to the note in hand’s focalization through dithyramb? So we shall find reason to claim presently.

T8 Leurini: (vi) ~ T11 Leurini: (v)

Σωκράτους δὲ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐστὶν εἰς αὐτόν λόγος λεγόμενος Ἴων.

There’s a Socrates, yes the philosopher, Dialogue with him, called *Ion*.

That accident again (only, typically, in rather better Greek).

T8 Leurini: (vii) ~ T11 Leurini: (vi)

μένηται αὐτοῦ καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν τοῖς Χωλιάμβοις, ὅτι πολλὰ ἔγραψε.

Callimachus also mentions him in the *Choliambi* as a prolific writer.

And finally... Our chief exhibit winds up pointing us in the direction of his cataloguing source and supremo—but as creative poet (*still* contriving to outdo its rival for style, to the end).

Our last distant descendant of Callimachus’ *Pinakes*, the *Suda* entry *sub nomine*, will prove half familiar, half new (T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* [ι 487] s.v. *Ion Chios*):

T4 Leurini: (i) ~ T9a Leurini: (iii)

Ἴων Χίος· τραγικὸς καὶ λυρικὸς καὶ φιλόσοφος,

Ion of Chios: tragedian, lyricist, philosopher,

Here begins our best candidate for disciplined main entry in our catalogue, *videl.* filed under tragedians, with the promise of two sub-entries to come, among melic poets, and in the prose section, among philosophers. This triplet of categories operates efficient systems technology—skewed towards neither *Triagmos* nor dithyrambic discography.

T4 Leurini: (ii) ~ T9a Leurini: (ii)

υιὸς Ὀρθομένων, ἐπὶ κλησιν δὲ Ξούθου.

son of Orthomenes-aka-Xuthus.

Initial identification by patronymic present and correct.

T4 Leurini: (iii)

ἤρξατο δὲ τὰς τραγωδίας διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῇς πρὸς Ὀλυμπιάδος. δράματα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἱβ', οἱ δὲ λ', ἄλλοι δὲ μ' φασιν.

Began to produce tragedies in Olympiad 82. Plays by him × 12 (some say 30, others 40).

Telling facts and quanta start up career and listing both. Precise date of début; on through-put, scrupulous variants recorded. Numbers are ever chancy—one story against another—and these are now transcribed to figure as ‘our’ guestimate of Ion product. But here ends the encyclopedic entry. See what follows.

T4 Leurini: (iv) ~ T11 Leurini: (i–ii)

οὗτος ἔγραψε περὶ μετεώρων καὶ συνθέτους λόγους· ὃν παίζων Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς Ἀοιδόν φησι.

He wrote on stratospherics using compound terms; he's the one that for fun Aristophanes the comic writer calls *Dawn's*.

Excised from the context of *Peace*, then syncopated for the dictionary, these “compound words on stratospheric topics” are a nonsense. And Aristophanes' jest is now fun strictly and solely as *non sequitur*. The palmary intertext supplied by the commentary was jettisoned in the précis process.

T4 Leurini: (v) ~ T8 Leurini: (v)

οὗτος τραγωδίαν νικήσας Ἀθήνησιν ἐκάστω τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔδωκε Χίου κεράμιον.

He was the one that on winning at tragedy at Athens gave each of the Athenians a pitcher of Chian wine.

To conclude, here is a less flowery version of that ‘story’ of winelake post-victory in tragedy (minus dithyramb). No place for the howler with Plato's *Ion*; no (bathetic?) pointer to a (withheld) quote from Callimachus—apparently at his most banal (“he wrote lots” is the maid-of-overwork of the Greek dictionary). Instead, a *verbatim* quote from the

most prominently displayed notice of Ion's existence of any that we can appreciate for ourselves.³⁸ The opening sound-bites ushering in the grandest spree of classical philology fetch readers of the *Deipnosophistae*, or *Diningdons*, straight from our host, the author—ludicrously named (for real) *Athenaeus*, or *The Athenian*—to his host, one (Roman—"Lord Household God") *Larensis*, and into his lavish dramatic dialogue *after* Plato with great helpings of praise for this millionaire bibliomaniac's generous custody: here is one who deserves to have thrown at him whole trifles of exotic exempla.³⁹

The barrage starts from the big one: (1) Alexander the Great. Then (2) for victory over the Spartans, Conon's literal hecatomb, on which he feasted all the Athenians. (3) Alcibiades, though, feasted the whole crowd at the Olympics, for winning first, second, and (a modest) fourth place in the chariots, plus a victory-song by Euripides. (4) Matched by Leophron at Olympia, song by Simonides. (5) The veggie Empedocles won the Olympic horse-race, and carved up an ox made of perfumery and spices for the whole crowd to share. Last but (not?) least in line, at (6), comes yer man, *Ion*, or (any old) *Ionian*.⁴⁰

T12 Leurini (= *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f; Suda α 731) = T4 Leurini: (v)

ὁ δὲ Χίος Ἴων τραγωδίαν νικήσας Ἀθήνησιν ἐκάστω τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔδωκε Χίου κεράμιον.

Ion of Chios on winning at tragedy at Athens gave each of the Athenians a pitcher of Chian wine.

Athenaeus' word kitschen was heavily quarried, and reproduced *verbatim*, by *Suda*, and his opening roster of assorted Greek throwers of mass binges will keep cropping up.⁴¹ At α 731, *Athenaios*' own (Hesychian) entry moves straight into gear with Alexander (losing his occasion and stealing disappeared Conon's, to ludicrous effect, as also at (acephalous) α 1123) followed by Alcibiades, Leophron, Empedocles, Ion—and, more (but not potlatch) generosity, from Tellias of Acragas (from the

³⁸ The *Suda* MSS are actually split on this item—in, out, or in the margin (Leurini 2000a: 3).

³⁹ "The economy of the logos is an imitation of the expensiveness of the dinner, and the arrangement of the books, of its serving", as the proem trumpets (Ath. 1b). On this Graeco-Roman culture of superpower Roman imperial riches guesting/hosted at encyclopedic Greek textual store-house, see essays in Braund and Wilkins (2002).

⁴⁰ Cf. χ 314: Χίον κεράμεϊον.

⁴¹ Cf. σ 1397: συμποσίον; and see also Eust. 1454.24 on Hom. *Od.* 3.8. *Deipnosophistae* at δ 429 ends by noting Alexander, Empedocles καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν; *Alcibiades*' entry at α 1280 ends with *his* sentence from Athenaeus' list.

next-but-one of the epitomated excerpts that are all we have of the first triad of books: 1.4).

* * *

Before the twentieth century, and the papyraceous resurrection of Callimachus, his *Iambi* were as good as lost. Thus Otto Schneider (1815–80: earliest work on the sources of the Scholia to Aristophanes (1838)) in 1873 could only register *Suda* s.v. διθυραμβοδιδασκαλοι as “fr.83^b”, and take this stab in the dark:

Callimachum autem Jonem propter multa opera scripta laudasse in Jambis vix credibile est, multo credibilis quod [August] Mein[eke] l.c. p. 165 seq. statuit [(1790–1870) repeat-editor of Aristophanes, and the fragments of the Greek Comic Poets (1839 through 1865), and ed. of Athenaeus (1858) and *Callimachi Cyrenensis Hymni et Epigrammata* (1861)], Callimachum tragicam (adde dithyrambicam) poesis viri propter tumiditatem derisisse.

The breakthrough came in exciting fits and successive starts as papyrus from Oxyrhynchus knitted together with ancient commentary to yield a patchy but holistic overview of the *Iamboi*. In particular, the self-styled *Diegesis* discovered in 1934 and soundly published by Vogliano (1937) gave us the opening line of each poem, plus tantalizingly brisk appreciations, which can be aligned with intermittently legible stretches of marvellous though tattered verse text.⁴² The legendary life-project of Rudolf C. F. O. Pfeiffer (1889–1979) from the early 1920s through past the late 1960s provided the hardware and led the charge. In the post-war decades, Callimachus emerged as the most influential poet for post-Alexandrian classical studies, as well as the figurehead and pioneer of classical scholarship: from *Callimachi Fragmenta nuper Reperta* (1921), *Kallimachosstudien* (1922), *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten* (1934) and the *editio maior Oxon.*, *Callimachus. I: Fragmenta* (1949), through the reveillé piece “The future of studies in the field of Hellenistic poetry” (*JHS* 75 (1955) 69–73), to *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (1968).

⁴² I excerpt “The” handy “History of the Text” in Clayman (1980) 1–10; cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 126–34 (between the headers: *The Pinakes of the Entire Body of Greek Literature and Lasting Effect of the Pinakes*). “Callimachus’s classification of the library lasted, and his published *Catalogue* was the basis of all such future work”: Ferguson (1980) 154–6, “The *Catalogue*”, at p. 156.

In particular, recovery of *Diegesis* 9.32–8, busy geeing us up for *Iamb* 13, is responsible for blessing Ion of Chios with a high profile cameo at the very heart of this revisionary sea-change in Hellenism:⁴³

Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κ᾽πολλόν, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω·
 ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομέ- | νους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδεΐᾳ ὧν
 | γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπάντων/ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι | Ἵωνα μιμεῖται τὸν
 τραγικόν· | ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῇ | σκευή
 τεκταινόμενον.

“Fine Muses and Apollo, to whom libations I do pour”

In this lemma, addressed to those finding fault with him for the sundry quality of the poems he writes, all of them / confronting them, he’s saying that *he’s miming Ion the tragedian*—but nobody finds fault with the craftsman who crafts sundry wares.

(T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in *Callim. Iamb.* 13, fr. 203 Pfeiffer)

No one should forget that none of us has (yet) seen Ion’s name in a *text* of Callimachus’ *Choliamb*s, the closest we get in the poem being (1) vv. 30–33, where the maestro scotches his straw man of a hostile critic and his “notion of ‘one poet, one genre’”:

τίς εἶπεν αὐτ[... 30
 σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθει, σὺ δ’ ἡ[ρῶο]ν,
 σὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώσω;
 δοκέω μὲν οὐδεῖς, ἀλλὰ...

Who said th[...]

You, go compose elegiac pentameters, you, do heroic epic,
 and you—you drew doing tragedy for your lot from the gods?
 No I do not think so—...

“‘Who said that?’, the poet asks in 30, and mentions...elegy, epic, and tragedy”. His voice fades out in a lacuna, then ‘the poet’s reply’ rallies with “the two examples of successful πολυειδεΐα; the carpenter, *and Ion*” (43–9 = T15a Leurini):⁴⁴

]ουχὶ μῶνον ἐξ. [...
 ο]υς τραγῳδοὺς ἀλλὰ κα[.....]. ν
 π]εντάμετρον οὐχ ἅπαξ. [.]ἐ]κρουσε 45
]σερω...φαυλά....ουσι
 Λυδὸν] πρὸς αὐλὸν λ.....καὶ χορδὰς

⁴³ Thus West begins his essay on Ion (1985: 71) with the words: “In his thirteenth Iambus Callimachus...”

⁴⁴ Kerkhecker (1999) 250–70, at p. 261: “There is, perhaps, an answer to his rhetorical question: Plato”.

]ην γὰρ ἐντελέες τε τὸ χρῆμα
 ...ἀνεπλάσθη

]not only hex[...
] tragedians, but als[o...
 p]entameter he struck up not just once
 ...†flawed stuff†...
 Lydian] reed tuning...and strings
 ...] it was all there, that phenomenon
 ...was manufactured

First, “Callimachus is making a surprisingly and provocatively Platonic claim: ... he *can* write all sorts of poetry”. Second, “48 f. appear to sum up and praise the excellence of Ion’s wide-ranging poetic achievements... To sum up, Ion is here credited with epic (? 43), tragedy (44), elegy (45) and lyric (47). Callimachus is not interested in his prose works”.⁴⁵ The kaleidoscopic polyphony of such hybrid textuality has increasingly led and exulted in readerly passion for self-enacting literary elusivity as the disarming glory of Callimachean poetics.⁴⁶ *Iamb* 13 has acquired the status of *locus classicus* in increasingly complexified discussions of ‘The *Iambi* and *Polyeideia*’,⁴⁷ which now swell to monographic diapason, witness Ben Acosta-Hughes’ *Polyeideia. The Iambi of Callimachus* (2002) 60–103, especially 82–9, “The Poet and Genre”, at 83–4:

Callimachus could thus answer the direct criticism his opponent offers here, clearly criticism of the *Iambi* and their composition, with a defense he draws from his entire poetic oeuvre. In this way he could answer criticism of *polyeideia* in one collection of poems with a defense of *polyeideia* drawn from all his work; Ion of Chios is then a sort of transparent paradigm of variety in a larger context (composition in many genres) as an exemplar for variety in a smaller one (this collection of iambic poems).

No doubt there is a downside to utilizing Ion as sheltering decoy, defamiliarizing screen, outrider figure—and Richard Hunter fingers it (1997: 45):

[I]t might be thought strange that Callimachus would align himself with a figure who, however prolific and however much he seems to us (and seemed to Callimachus?) to be a Hellenistic man ‘before his time’,

⁴⁵ Kerkhecker (1999) 262, 265.

⁴⁶ Dawson (1950) can be said to have blessed this child of the delta: on Callimachus’ Ion, see p. 131.

⁴⁷ Clayman (1980) 48–52, expanding her landmark (1976) paper, “Callimachus’ thirteenth *Iamb*: the last word”.

certainly belonged to the second rank of classical literature; as an answer to his ‘critics’, the example of Ion is unlikely to have done Callimachus much good.

But there is a juicy upside to this. One to savour, through the allusion in the buttonholing at v. 32: σὺ δὲ τραγωδεῖν ἐκ θεῶν ἐκκληρώσω; to Plato’s *Ion* (534bc), where Socrates makes out that poets compose by a divine apportionment (θεία μοίρα), so “*A* writes dithyrambs, *B* encomia, *C* hyporchemata, *D* epics, *E* iambics, and each of them is no good in other kinds”:

[W]e must at least consider the possibility that Callimachus has somehow run three different Ions together—the eponym of the Ionians, Ion of Chios and the Platonic character (evoked by the echo of Plato’s work).⁴⁸

Wilful botchery with this accident-courting ‘proper name’ would make consummate serio-comic drollery for the arch-encyclopedist of Greek literary history, doomed by his library labour to orchestrate the likes of Ion the shameleon. So many strings to his bow, that many inter-articulated listings to (dis)entwine (~ Ion *the* Ionian ~ Ion the interlocutor ~ ...). Yes, we must be right to imagine that when Callimachus said (whatever he did to the effect) that Ion “wrote many things” (T8 Leurini: (vii) = T11 Leurini: (vi)), he *cannot* have meant so little as that refrain of the space-saving/switched-off catalogue,⁴⁹ and *must* have meant more than that Ion required the multi-sub-categorization of any melic-elegiac poet ever registered in the *Pinakes*.⁵⁰

On one side, the Ion stunt *is* snug as an iambic shrug.⁵¹ But Ion was also, for real, the only canonical (sc. fifth century) tragedian with any extended range,⁵² and authorial *polyeideia* did need to be invented before

⁴⁸ Hunter (1997) 46.

⁴⁹ ἔγραψε πολλά: for example, in *Suda*, Herodian and Lollianus; plus *both* Plutarch (of Chaeronea), π 1793, and Plutarch son of Nestorius, Athenian, philosopher and teacher of Syrianus, π 1794.

⁵⁰ For example, *Suda* σ 107: Sappho, ἔγραψε δὲ μελῶν λυρικῶν βιβλία θ’ ... ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ ἰάμβους καὶ μονοδίας, “Sappho wrote 9 books of lyric songs ... she wrote: epigrams + elegies + iambi + solos”. Or σ 439: Simonides, sea-battle in Doric, elegy and lyric; threnoi, encomia, epigrams, paeans, tragedies καὶ ἄλλα. Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 130.

⁵¹ In *Suda*, compare (σ 871) Sotades: ἰαμβογράφος ... εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ εἶδη πλεῖστα ... καὶ ἕτερα, “iamb-writer: ... he’s in sundry genres ... besides these”.

⁵² Aeschylus’ elegies, Sophocles’ elegies and prose *On the chorus*, are all they muster between them in *Suda*. Under the banner of the biographeme “Versatility”, Lefkowitz musters just Euripides, Sophocles and Aeschylus as “physically talented Athenian poets”, and “the poetically talented Athenian lawgiver Solon, the Athenian general

it could become a new poetics' grail.⁵³ So, on the other, we should ponder the absence of any sign of acclaim for Ion's urbane sprawl *outside Callimachus*, at any time prior to the revival of Callimacheanism in the light of the recovered *Diegeseis*. If "ION (2) of Chios" in the 1990s had become, before all, "an unusually versatile poet and prose author",⁵⁴ this was because "ION OF CHIOS: HIS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE" had itself by then shifted in line with a newly *authorized*—Callimachean—take on classical Greece (Dover 1986: 27).⁵⁵

He was a man of remarkable *versatility*, whose works have conferred on him the *unusual* distinction of inclusion in the modern standard corpora of fragments of the historians, pre-Socratic philosophers, tragic poets, and elegists.

Tragic Ion himself made one character rhapsodize on the hedgehog's proverbial single strategy,⁵⁶ while another stigmatizes the inconstant octopus (44 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F38 from Athenaeus 91d on "urchins terrestrial and marine", citing Ion's *Phoenix or/and Oeneus/Kaineus*; and 45 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F36 from Athenaeus 318e on polypods, citing *Phoenix I*). But who wanted (us) to see him as a phenomenon? Only Callimachus chamelionized this so *un-Fifth Century* jack of all trades—riding the crest of the Athenian wave, before the wreck / just outside the medals / fit only to lick the boots of genius...⁵⁷ Law unto himself, Lusus. Freak, Genius. Hick. Hack. One-Too-Many-Mornings. Also-Ran... "Ion

Themistocles, and Theseus, founder of lawful government as well as a fighter and a general" (1981: 94).

⁵³ "The" Callimachean "counter-genre" could only emerge through and after the internalization of genericism: Klein (1974).

⁵⁴ "Ion of Chios... was indeed a very versatile *writer*": Hunter (1997) 45.

⁵⁵ Dover (1994) 210–1 fills us in on the visit: "the Aegean in May... wild tulips... The Mother Superior gave us beans, bread, and a delectable liqueur, and said grace...; a contrast to the mumbled or chattered grace at dinner in a college".

⁵⁶ Warden Bowra (1940b).

⁵⁷ In fact, *any* comment is a rarity. (1) Appreciation of Ion: T11, T8, T4 Leurini, Aristophanes παίζων... φησί, "in fun... says"; T11, T8 Leurini: περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο...; T8 Leurini: καὶ πάνυ δόκιμος ἦν..., "and he was really famous" (see above); T16 Leurini = *FGH* 392 T4 = Strabo 14.1.35, ἄνδρες δὲ Χίῳ γεγονάσιν ἐλλόγοιμοι "Ἴων..., "men of Chios have become renowned—Ion..."; 118* Leurini = *FGH* 392 F17b = Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 8.1.1 (717b), ἔφη γὰρ οὐ φάύλως εἰπεῖν "Ἴωνα..., "he said that Ion said, spot on..."; 69* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F54 = [Plut.] *Cons. ad Apoll.* 22 (113b, on Oriental superstition), "Ἴων γοῦν ὁ τραγικὸς ποιητής, οὐκ ἀνήκοος ὢν τῆς τούτων εὐηθείας..., "Well, Ion the tragic poet, not turning a deaf ear to these guys' naïveté...". (2) Deprecation of Ion: T17 = *TrGF* 19 T6 = [Longinus] *Subl.* 33.5, Ion to Sophocles as Bacchylides to Pindar, etc., as above; 24 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F19 =

appears to have had no imitators in the genre that he had invented". Until Callimachus invented Ion as the lesson of counter-genericism. Whence the (assisted) Birth of the Author (*Suda* κ 227):

Callimachus, son of Battus and Mesatma, from Cyrene, scholar... He was so painstaking that he wrote poems for every metre, and in prose, too, put together a very large number of compositions. The books written by him are upwards of 800... Among his books are the following: *Enter Io, Semele, Argos Settled, Arcadia, Glaucus, Great Expectations*, satyr-plays, tragedies, comedies, lyrics, *Ibis...*, *Museum*, *Tablets cataloguing the illustrious across all culture, + their compositions, in 120 books*, *Tablet and Record of Faculty in chronological order from the origins*, *Tablet cataloguing Democrates' Glosses and Tracts*, *Names of the Months by clan and city*, *Foundations of Island Communities and Cities, plus changes in nomenclature*, *On Rivers in Europe*, *On Wonders and Miracles in the Peloponnese and Italy*, *On changes of nomenclature for Fish*, *On Winds*, *On Birds*, *On Rivers in the Inhabited World*, *Wonders covering the whole of Planet Earth, compiled on a regional basis*.

The Artist as bibliothèque blurb—and never a choliamb in sight above this piled catalogue of exhausting cataloguing. Isn't it ionic? Versatility is hard to think with—as impossible to narrativize as to list.⁵⁸

Yet; still.

Hesychius [σ 1515] *sub verbo* σπῖλον Παρνασσίαν· Ἴων Ὀμφάλη. οὐκ εἶδ' σπιλάδες γὰρ πέτραι, “‘crag of Parnassus’: Ion in *Omphale*, and *nuls points*, as ‘craggs are rocks’”.

⁵⁸ Sorell (1970); Maund (1987).

CHAPTER THREE

SHOT FROM THE CANON: SOURCES, SELECTIONS, SURVIVALS

GUY OLDING

Introduction

Ion's piecemeal survival makes assessment of his role and significance at once intriguing and frustrating. In this volume, Christopher Pelling points out the flaw in approaching Ion's importance "backwards", but doing so can illuminate how he was regarded and treated in the classical period. His fragments are limited in number, 126 in Leurini's edition; they are brief, often only a line or two long; and they all depend on some intermediary author, in either quotation or paraphrase. The circumstances of selection and reproduction, and the interests and methods of later generations of scholars and authors are better represented than the actual work of Ion. Thus his influence on early Greek literature, and the variety of his work, make him a figure of particular interest for a study of the survival of ancient literature and the process of canon formation.

Ion's Status

Ion was certainly reasonably well known in his own time. He won the tragic competition at Athens at least once.¹ The *Suda* records the number of his dramas as "twelve or thirty or forty", perhaps meaning that he presented tetralogies on ten occasions: forty plays altogether, thirty excluding the satyr plays.² Aristophanes refers to him as a (diffuse)

¹ The datum presumably comes from Aristotle's *didaskaliai*, even if we doubt the story associated with it, that Ion rewarded every Athenian with a measure of wine: T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios; T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f.

² T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios; see Huxley (1965) 41.

lyric poet, and Isocrates (sarcastically) as one of “the ancient wise men” (τῶν παλαιῶν σοφιστῶν), a natural philosopher.³ Both apparently expected their audiences to know who he was. Ion’s *Epidemiai*, which seems to have comprised memoirs of some sort, may also have had some impact. It related one of Pericles’ rhetorical boasts—that the defeat of Samos, which took Athens nine months, was a greater achievement than the Trojan War, which took the whole of Greece ten years. Ion may therefore be the source for the figure’s recurrence in the fourth century orators, Demosthenes, Isocrates and Hyperides.⁴ These examples suggest Ion’s prominence in, and within memory of, his own time, and cover most parts of his diverse output—tragedy, lyric poetry, philosophy and biography.

There is some evidence that Ion was known and well regarded after this period. A few observations about the process by which his works were transmitted may be appropriate. Book publication and trade—original compositions and text versions of oral performances—had ceased to be a novelty by the late fifth century. For instance, in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, Dionysus says that he was reading Euripides’ *Andromeda*.⁵ This remark occurs very early on, before Euripides’ alleged bookishness becomes part of the play’s humour, so it must be plausible, if not literally true. The author himself likely gave or lent a copy of his written text to friends and patrons. His heirs were doubtless important as well. Sophocles’ grandson presumably had a text of *Oedipus Coloneus* as he was able to produce it after the playwright’s death. Conversely, the inheritors of Aristotle’s and Theophrastus’ libraries are said to have neglected them, inhibiting their circulation before they were ‘liberated’ by Sulla.⁶ This factor is worth noting in Ion’s case, as his family may have been persecuted only a few years after his death: Thucydides records that the Spartans executed a Tydeus, the son of Ion, during the Chian revolt of 411 BC (T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3). If so, the survival of *any* of his work after the fifth century may be more remarkable than is usually appreciated.

³ T7 Leurini = Ar. *Pax* 832–837; 114 Leurini = 36A6 DK [first text] = Isoc. *Antid.* 268.

⁴ 110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = Plut. *Per.* 28.7–8; see Isoc. 9.65, 4.83, 4.186, 5.111–12; Dem. 30.10–11; Hyp. 6.35. Oral tradition is as likely.

⁵ Ar. *Ran.* 52–3. Also, for example, Pl. *Ap.* 26de; Xen. *An.* 7.5.14. See especially Harris (1989).

⁶ *Hyp. II* Soph. *OC*; Plut. *Sulla* 26; Easterling (1997b) 216–7.

The advent of systematic book-collecting naturally increased texts' chances of survival. Private libraries existed from the fifth century. Systematic collections appeared in the fourth: Plato's works were preserved by the Academy, a wealthy coterie dedicated to the study and perpetuation of the master; Aristotle promoted large-scale data collection; and the Athenian politician Lycurgus had the texts of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides preserved in the Metroön.⁷ The paragon of libraries was Alexandria, founded in the early third century. This acquired hundreds of thousands of scrolls in the first fifty years of its existence. Figures, originating in the *Pinakes* of the pioneering bibliographer Callimachus, indicate its holdings and therefore the effectiveness of publishing and preservation in this period. Plato's corpus, as far as we know, is complete. Euripides wrote 92 plays, of which Alexandria possessed 78, a survival rate of 85 per cent. Sophocles seems to have written 123 plays, of which Alexandria had about 110, or 89 per cent.⁸ The *Suda*'s item, that Ion wrote "twelve or thirty or forty" dramas may mean that twelve plays were actually held at Alexandria, a supposition supported by the fact that eleven titles are known. If so, out of his 40 plays, 12 were published and preserved in the 150 years after his death, a survival rate of 30 per cent.

Publication in the ancient world meant that texts were produced in response to demand, whether through personal contacts or commercial copying. One might reasonably suspect that the number of copies will reflect interest.⁹ Hence, the number of extant ancient manuscripts will provide an indication of use and literary taste, with due caution in view of the many imponderables of the papyrus record.¹⁰ As it happens, apart from two doubtful identifications,¹¹ Ion is completely unattested in independent manuscripts. This does not commend his status, though, of course, some *must* have existed. In fact, although papyri reveal a

⁷ [Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 841f.

⁸ *Vita Euripidea*; Pearson (1917) xvi–xxi.

⁹ Starr (1987) 220.

¹⁰ Papyri are almost all from Egypt, mostly from provincial areas, and concentrated in the second and third centuries AD. However, the comparative distribution of literary authors has remained fairly constant over the years of discovery, as has the distribution of papyri over chronological periods. The sample seems to be random and representative: see Willis (1968) 206, 210–3; cf. Turner (1980) 50.

¹¹ 151*** Leurini = *POxy* 1083 + 2453 = *TrGF* Soph. FF **1130–1133; 152*** Leurini = *POxy* 2382 (not *POxy* 2362 as in Leurini 2000a) = *TrGF* Adesp. F664. Both second century AD—see Leurini (2000a) 90. See Easterling in this volume on the discovery of the opening of *Omphale* in a papyrus work of literary criticism.

reasonably wide representation of lost poets, 'lost' tragedians are rare. Only Critias, Sophocles the younger, Astydamas the younger, Chaeremon, Theodectes and Moschion have been identified.¹²

In the absence of manuscripts, the remains of Ion's corpus depend entirely on secondary authors. However, the selection and presentation of fragments is a function of the writers' interests, intentions and methods. The image of Ion presented may not be representative of the scope of his corpus or the character of individual works.

There are a reasonable number of Hellenistic references to Ion, and these are fairly favourable. Strabo describes him as one of the three most celebrated Chians, fair praise in a competitive field (T16 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T4 = Strabo 14.1.35). This expresses Strabo's own claim to critical judgement, but there is no reason to suppose that this was an unusual view. Callimachus cited Ion's *polyeideia* as a justification for his own efforts (T15a Leurini = Callim. *Iamb.* 13, fr. 203 Pfeiffer; T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in *Callim. Iamb.* 13). Baton of Sinope wrote a monograph, *On Ion the Poet*, probably a gossipy biography (T21ab, 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41), and the Academician Arcesilaus "studied" (ἐχαρακτήριζε) him.¹³ Didymus—the super-scholar of the first century BC—composed commentaries on two of his plays, though we do not know how comprehensive these exegeses were.¹⁴ 'Longinus' refers to Ion in a manner which, while not entirely flattering, presupposes some kind of critical respectability (T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = *Subl.* 33.5). A number of other Hellenistic scholars also refer to him.¹⁵ The general impression is that Ion and his

¹² See *TrGF*; cf. Willis (1968) Table 4. There are also a few hypotheses to plays (this implies that copies once existed somewhere, but says nothing about their distribution) and, of course, quotations in secondary authors.

¹³ T20 Leurini = D. L. 4.31. There is a tradition that Arcesilaus never wrote anything, but this need not be anything more than an apologist's attempt to make his sceptical philosophy concrete (see Plut. *De Alex. fort.* 328a; D. L. 4.32).

¹⁴ On Ion's *Agamemnon*: T31a Leurini = Ath. 468d (Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ τοῦ δράματος Ἐξηγητικῷ..., "Didymus in his *Exegetikos* on the play..."); on *Omphale*: T31b Leurini = Ath. 634e (Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν ταῖς εἰς Ἴωνα Ἀντεξηγήσεσιν..., "Didymus the grammarian, in his *Counterexplanations* on Ion").

¹⁵ Epigenes: T22a Leurini = Callim. fr. 449 Pfeiffer; T22b Leurini = Ath. 468c; T9b Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F25c = *Suda* s.v. Orpheus [o 654]; 1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468de. Aristophanes: 28 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F25 = Ar. Byz. fr. 23 A-C Slater *ap.* Eust. 1761.31 (see also Pollux 5.101; Schol. Hom. Θ 545 [*Anecdota Parisina* 3.46.6–8 Cramer]; Hdn. 2.767.20 Lentz; Choerob. *Gr. Gr.* 4.1.344.2). Aristarchus: T26 Leurini (see 26b Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F23 = Ath. 634ce; Hsch. μ 3). Crates: T30 Leurini (see 13 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F10 = Ath. 495ab). Mnaseas: T25a Leurini (see 88 Leurini = 743 *PMG* = Miller *Mélanges* 361; Zenob. Ath. 2.35 [4.270 Bühler]); T25b Leurini (see

works were considered worthy of *scholarly* attention, bearing in mind the general dearth of extant Hellenistic literature, and the fact that these references are themselves the result of later authors' selection.

Roman and Byzantine scholarship and literature are much more comprehensive. Moreover, they coincide with a massive growth in interest in classical Greece. This began in the second century, the period known as the Second Sophistic, but lasted until the end of antiquity—evident in the contents of Photius' *Bibliotheca* in the ninth century, and Critobulus' imitation of Thucydides in his description of the Turkish conquest of Constantinople.¹⁶ Whatever its cause—the cumulative effect of a pervasively classical education, or desire for an idealized Greek cultural identity as an alternative to Roman temporal dominance¹⁷—it illustrates the possibility for renewed interest in neglected literature, as its features are appreciated anew or for the first time.¹⁸ The ancient world was used as a model and point of comparison in all areas. In language, archaism became associated with authenticity and purity. Classical authors were gleaned for sententious sayings—jewels from the treasury of a common heritage. Writers used them to add colour and emphasis, support an argument with an ancient authority or well-turned phrase that has the force of a gnomic expression, show off erudition, and provide moral edification.¹⁹

Ion, apparently neglected since the first century BC, enjoyed new interest in the Second Sophistic. Almost half of his fragments come from this period. Yet they do not give the impression that his work was valued on its own account; rather, it was used to illuminate something else. Athens dominated the classical tradition, to the extent that Greek history was Athenian history, and linguistic archaism was Atticism.²⁰ Citations of Ion conform to this trend. The historical anecdotes of the *Epidemiai* concern Athenian individuals, though it is likely that he described others, such as the Spartan king Archidamus, whom he

22 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17a = *POxy* 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127)). Callistratus: T27 Leurini (see 16 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F13 = Hsch. κ 4426). Philemon: T28 Leurini (see 1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468de). Demetrius of Scepsis: T29 Leurini (see T9a, 114 Leurini = *FGtH* 392 T3, F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion). Apollonides: T32 Leurini (= T9a Leurini).

¹⁶ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) Chapter 2, especially p. 47.

¹⁷ Bowie (1974) 197–209.

¹⁸ Smith (1984) 31–2.

¹⁹ Easterling (2002) 25–30.

²⁰ Bowie (1974) 195–7.

almost certainly met.²¹ The *Foundation of Chios* is a good example of the selectivity of our sources. This survives in only three fragments: one is preserved in a selection of ancient examples of wine mixing (99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e); another because it contained an unusual word (recorded as an Attic variant);²² the longest because Pausanias, defying the normal practice, preferred to hunt out local sources.²³

Early references to Ion suggest that he enjoyed a certain critical regard. Nevertheless it was not enough to suggest that he was really popular in his own right, or that his work received the extensive commentaries necessary to integrate him into the mainstream of scholarly and cultural respectability.²⁴ Post-Hellenistic references do not seem very interested in Ion or his works for their own sake. He is typically cited as a source for something else. This is reflected in the form of his fragments, which are mostly brief quotations or paraphrases rather than entire or even substantial sections. Works are more likely to be preserved complete if they are valued for their literary merit, cultural importance or their author's status. If valued for their content, they are prone to being taken out of context and adapted to fit the secondary author's needs.

Preservation and Propagation

A reference in a secondary author is a direct index of dissemination and interest only if it reflects first-hand familiarity. This is often doubtful, as writers may use and re-use scholarship rather than examine originals. Older works are progressively replaced by new ones written to meet contemporary needs, all the time using the same basic data, excerpted and adapted countless times. Few of Ion's fragments come from sources predating the second century AD, and more than half belong to the

²¹ Elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c may be addressed to him: Jacoby (1947a) 7. See Katsaros in this volume.

²² 97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Elym. Or.* s.v. λόγχη. Cf. 112* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F11 = Phot. α 466 (= *Suda* α 729), which may also come from an anti-atticist lexicon, ultimately Aristophanes of Byzantium: Jacoby (1947a) 12n3.

²³ 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10. Pausanias' Ionian history may be intended to correct other accounts, especially Herodotus: Moggi (1996) especially 92–7.

²⁴ Pfeiffer (1968) 223.

fifth century or later, which can hardly represent the periods in which his works were most widespread. Instead, it indicates the extent of Ion's scholarly and literary predigestion.

Such practices are attested as early as Plato, who refers to collections of ancient poetry made for the purposes of education and edification. The elder Pliny and Plutarch mention that, in the course of their reading, they excerpted illustrative material on topics that interested them.²⁵ Such practices may well underlie much extant 'literature'. The influence of a collection could be long lasting: the list of aphorisms on an inscription from the region of Cyzicus, dating to c. 300 BC, is reflected in Sosiades' "Sayings of the Seven Sages", which is itself quoted by Stobaeus in the fifth century AD.²⁶ Another example is the "Sayings of the Spartans". These characteristically pungent and pithy expressions, many gleaned from literary sources, such as Herodotus, were a recognized genre by the fourth century BC, and appear throughout later classical literature. The corpus must have been more or less fixed by the early third century BC, presumably in a literary form, as much potentially useful later material, such as the revolution of Agis and Cleomenes, is virtually absent.²⁷ Works were also often combined in compendia, or epitomized. Abbreviated forms of literature were encouraged by both intellectual trends and physical factors: 'rationalization' of the curriculum, the difficulty of finding particular books, the awkwardness of scrolls. They seem to become more widespread in later times.²⁸

Scholarly tools, such as lexica and glossaries and commentaries, are a major source of fragments of lost authors. The process of repeated re-use of existing scholarship is particularly evident. Since the function of such tools is essentially practical, they are especially prone to being changed and adapted by the removal of unwanted material, compression to reduce length, or addition of material from other sources to make them more comprehensive. In this way, old data are preserved in new contexts (as Henderson discusses in this volume). A few works effectively monopolized their fields, synthesizing existing works so comprehensively that they formed the basis for all subsequent efforts. Especially prominent is Didymus, the chief conduit of Alexandrian

²⁵ Pl. *Laus* 811a; Plin. *Ep.* 3.5; Plut. *Reg. imper. apophth.* 172ce, *De cohib. ira* 457d, *De tranq. anim.* 464f.

²⁶ Pearson (1917) lxxxix–xc.

²⁷ Tigerstedt (1965) 1.24–6.

²⁸ Mejer (1978) 16–29; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 31–3.

scholarship to later periods. Likewise, the lexicon of Diogenianus (second century AD) was an epitome of the first century Pamphilus' great lexicon in 95 books and almost completely superseded it. It continued to be used as late as the twelfth century. These two figures are cited repeatedly as the sources of all manner of general or specialized works: dictionaries, commentaries, collections of proverbs and so on.²⁹ Close to half the citations of Ion's fragments (42 per cent: 81 out of 193) come from lexica. Most of these are late, belonging to the fifth century or later, and almost certainly relying on lexicography and other scholarship conducted centuries earlier in the Hellenistic period. The same is true of other scholarly tools, such as commentaries and scholia, which derive from the same body of scholarship. For instance, when Harpocration quotes the first line of Ion's philosophical tract *Triagmos*, he is clearly referring to a version of Callimachus' *Pinakes*, updated by the addition of later scholars' opinions.³⁰

'Literary' authors, such as Strabo, Plutarch, Athenaeus and Pausanias, can indicate how much an author—such as Ion—was known and read. Internal evidence can help to determine whether or not a fragment is known from personal reading or through an intermediary. Athenaeus certainly knew some genres intimately—like Attic comedy—but elsewhere his use of scholarly tools is obvious. When he quotes from Ion's tragedy *Agamemnon* to describe various types of drinking cups, he clearly uses a lexicon. Not only does he refer explicitly to Didymus and Pamphilus, but the list itself is in alphabetical order.³¹ Likewise, where a discrete fragment is used by several different authors, or appears in a series on a certain theme, we may suspect that a collection of excerpts lies behind it. For instance, Plutarch gives Ion's fragment 118* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F17ab = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d; *Quaest. conv.* 717b—"wisdom (*sophia*) and fortune (*tyche*) are dissimilar but produce similar results"—along with other quotes on the same themes, namely various poets on 'fortune', and Demosthenes on 'steadfastness'. But since he quotes 118* Leurini again elsewhere quite casually, and since it does not turn up in other places where it would be apposite, such as Stobaeus'

²⁹ Naoumides (1969); Pfeiffer (1968) 197–202, 275–9; Pearson (1917) xl–xliv, lxii–lxiii.

³⁰ T9a, 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion; cf. Jacoby (1947a) 15–6. In general, see Pfeiffer (1968) 222–4; Naoumides (1969) 199–201; Pearson (1917) lxiiff.

³¹ 1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468de; cf. Pearson (1917) lvi.

chapters on fortune (1.6.7), Plutarch probably knew it from his own reading. It may be true that a writer's familiarity with the source of a fragment is proportional to its suitability and ease of integration into its new context—that is, when it looks least like a discrete fragment and most like a spontaneous allusion. (This, of course, invokes the difficult question of how to isolate some part of a text and meaningfully call it a 'fragment' in the first place.)

Authors of scholarly tools and 'literary' authors prefer different genres as sources. Ion's fragments largely come from his tragedies, but literary authors preserve a higher proportion of his non-tragic poetry and prose than do lexicographers. I use a statistical approach to illustrate this, though with some diffidence. Determining the category of both a fragment and a source inevitably involves some arbitrariness. However, the results may help to indicate the way in which Ion was used and conceptualized. TABLE 1 shows the number of citations to Ion's fragments according to their genre. TABLE 2 shows this as they appear in different types of sources.³²

TABLE 1: Genres of Ion's Fragments

	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Tragedy	137	71%
Non-tragic poetry	25	13%
Prose works	31	16%
<i>Total</i>	<i>193</i>	

TABLE 2: Genres of Ion's Fragments by Source

	<i>Lexica & glossaries</i>	<i>Commentaries & scholia</i>	<i>Anthologies</i>	<i>Literary authors</i>
Tragedy	70 (87%)	28 (74%)	5 (63%)	34 (51%)
Non-tragic poetry	6 (7%)	5 (13%)	1 (12%)	13 (20%)
Prose	5 (6%)	5 (13%)	2 (25%)	19 (29%)
<i>Total</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>66</i>

³² There are more citations than fragments because some are cited more than once.

The most striking feature is the overwhelming preference for Ion's tragic fragments in lexica and glossaries: 87 per cent. This is reflected in the second and third columns as well, which represent other sorts of scholarly tools. While literary authors cite Ion's tragedies as often as his non-tragic poetry and prose combined (51, 20 and 29 per cent respectively), the last two are significantly better represented. They, in fact, provide the majority of *all* fragments of non-tragic poetry (52 per cent: 13 out of 25) and prose (61 per cent: 19 out of 31).

The varying distribution of fragments shows collectors' different interests, sources and methods. Tragedy's imagery, style and sententious quotes dominate classical culture to the end of antiquity, long after it ceased to be produced in anything like its original form or, indeed, at all.³³ Yet literary authors reflect educated tastes over a wide spectrum, and are free to make allusions to all genres. Scholarly tools reflect need, such as explaining obscure and archaic vocabulary. The *Lexeis* of Aristophanes of Byzantium, for instance, seems to have used mainly playwrights.³⁴ Other scholarly tools—commentaries and anthologies—have a higher proportion of non-tragic poetry and prose, probably a function of their more specialized purposes.

Canon Formation and the Development of Genre

A canonical selection originates as nothing more than a preference for certain works, distinguished for their literary—usually poetic—skill, and association with certain traditions and values. For a work to be preferred and disseminated, it must have on-going relevance to cultural and intellectual standards. It becomes canonical when its value transcends these conditions, in fact, creating the standards that make it useful and desirable.³⁵

The existence of canons does not presuppose the recognition of genres, but the two concepts are complementary. Authors came to be grouped and then identified according to the characteristics of their

³³ On tragedy's on-going cultural importance and changing forms, see Green (1994); Easterling (1997b).

³⁴ Of course, even technical works operated according to the same cultural standards, and could regard a distinguished literary authority as a source of appropriate evidence. The medical dictionaries of Bacchius and Erotian are illustrated with tragic quotations: Pearson (1917) lxxviii.

³⁵ Smith (1984) 29–33.

work. The informal differentiation of genres can be seen in Plato's *Symposium* 223d, where the comedian Aristophanes and the tragedian Agathon view their techniques as so different that they vigorously resist the argument that they actually use the same knowledge. Different genres rarely appear together in the one manuscript, even when they have the same author. For instance, Sophocles' and Euripides' lyric poems are not preserved with their tragedies.³⁶ The process of distinguishing genres was assisted by the fact that works' occasions and styles tended to be associated with certain formal characteristics, especially metre. This was adopted as the central organizing principle for the acme of bibliographic classification, Callimachus' *Pinakes*. Whether this was the Library of Alexandria's official catalogue or a bibliographical dictionary, Callimachus' system became ubiquitous and was never superseded.³⁷ Identifying particular types of literature—whether or not a conscious intellectual exercise—naturally encourages the naming of exemplars of each type. This is a secondary type of canon, based on conformity with certain recognized characteristics.

The current meaning of 'canon' is a little misleading: in Alexandrian scholarship such authors were οἱ ἐγκριθέντες ("the included"). The only criterion seems to have been antiquity: few named figures are post-classical. The process was, in practice, self-justifying, as it consisted in and encouraged the concentration of scholarly effort. οἱ ἐγκριθέντες were οἱ πραττομένοι, those "treated" by grammarians and commentators. For instance, Aristophanes' *Lexeis* seems to have drawn only upon certain authors for whom critical recensions existed, which itself implies that they were considered particularly important.³⁸ Quintilian refers to the judgements of Aristophanes and his successor Aristarchus as definitive. Though opinions varied, certain figures were uncontested: Homer is always foremost, overall *and* in his particular field of epic, and Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides are always pre-eminent among the tragedians.³⁹

³⁶ In fact, their lyric poems only survive through indirect tradition.

³⁷ Pfeiffer (1968) 128–33; cf. Harvey (1955).

³⁸ Schol. Dion. Thrax 20.1, 21.17–19; Schol. Nicander *Ther.* 11; *Suda* α 3932 [Aristophanes]. Pfeiffer (1968) 203–8.

³⁹ The three tragedians' status is implicit as early as Aristophanes' *Frogs*, in Lycurgus' law (see note 7 above), and is assumed or made explicit in a number of Hellenistic and Roman sources. In the late fourth century, Alexander the Great carried copies of these three with him (Plut. *Alex.* 8) and Heraclides of Pontus wrote an *On the Three Tragic Poets* (Περὶ τῶν τριῶν τραγῳδοποιῶν: D. L. 5.88). Quintilian and Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Ion, in fact, appears on two ancient lists of tragic poets—that is, a selection of the genre’s exemplars, and implicitly canons of some kind. One is a tenth century manuscript from Mount Athos that lists him with Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Achaëus. The other belongs to the twelfth century (John?) Tzetzes, with Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Arion, Thespis, Phrynichus and Achaëus and “thousands of other recent ones”.⁴⁰ If these lists derive from some earlier list—they can hardly be the product of original Byzantine scholarship—they suggest that Ion was regarded as ‘canonical’ at some stage. However, this assumption is not justified. Nowhere else is Ion ranked with the three universally recognized tragedians. Moreover, other information on the Byzantine lists is suspicious. A modest number of fragments of Thespis, Phrynichus and Achaëus I are known, and they are not found in any extant papyrus manuscript. Though they may have been regarded as important figures in the history of tragedy, we may doubt that much of their work was available for critical assessment even to the Alexandrians. Arion is a particularly unlikely inclusion. He is an early and almost legendary figure, chiefly associated with dithyrambic poetry. There was a tradition, apparently going back to Solon, that he contributed to the ‘tragic style’, though this can hardly mean ‘tragedy’ as such. We may suspect that this supposed contribution (and his famous exploit of riding a dolphin from Sicily to the Peloponnese) is responsible for his place in this canon.⁴¹ Likewise, it is plausible that some scholars, impressed by Ion’s association with Aeschylus and Sophocles, not to mention other important figures and memorable anecdotes, assumed that he *must* have been an important tragedian and worthy of inclusion.⁴²

Popular regard and the organizational demands of scholarship helped to establish the canon, but the greatest influence was probably from educational practices. By the fourth century BC, the curriculum had become increasingly sophisticated and revolved around a literary

name Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides explicitly (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.66–68; Dion. Hal. *De imit.* 31.2.10 Usener-Radermacher), apparently following Aristophanes and Aristarchus (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.54; cf. Cic. *Att.* 16.11.2). Aristophanes commented that the plot of Euripides’ *Medea* had been used “by neither of the others” (*Hyp.*).

⁴⁰ T19 Leurini = *TrGF* CAT A 3 = Tab. Montefalconii 3; T18 Leurini = *TrGF* CAT A 2 = Tzetz. in Lyc. *Alex.* 2.

⁴¹ Arion’s testimonia: *TrGF* 1.227.

⁴² Ion and Aeschylus and Sophocles: T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = [Longinus] *Subl.* 33.5; 101 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F7 = Schol. M Aesch. *Pers.* 432; 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d; 108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de; *Quomodo adul.* 29f.

corpus. Physical remains preserved in Egypt provide particularly useful data: papyri, ostraka and writing tablets. The texts found in educational contexts generally reflect those in all literary papyri, and doubtless helped form them. Homer is the best represented author, followed by Euripides and Menander. Isocrates is the leading prose author. Lost authors are attested but become rare over time.⁴³ It is lost authors who show, conspicuously, the progressive reduction in format. Longer passages (eight lines or more) and passages in notebooks (and this implies more sophisticated exercises) are common in the Ptolemaic period but are virtually unattested after the second century AD. Shorter passages (frequently *gnomai*) are most common between the second and fourth centuries AD.⁴⁴ This reflects the tendency for literature, especially the less popular varieties, to appear in more and more abbreviated forms. However, as the same passages are not repeated endlessly and mechanically, it seems that teachers could still make their own selections, at least until the late Roman period. The increasing preponderance of shorter passages may reflect a change in taste or in the availability of texts, if, for instance, teachers relied more on anthologies (which may or may not be new themselves).

The selection of authors in the curriculum was not formally organized around genre but some were inevitably preferred for particular purposes. Teaching reading and writing seems to have been remarkably uniform across the Graeco-Roman world. It started with writing exercises to develop students' manual skills, then associating sound values with letters and syllables, and moved on to more advanced exercises in composition. All stages employed literary models. Younger students' exercises were short passages, generally sayings with morally edifying content (*gnomai*), which were usually extracts from ancient poets. These were used at all levels, but older students would be given more difficult literature to develop stylistic sensitivity and skill in argumentation, especially if they were aiming for an official or legal career. For instance, one exercise required the student to compose an indictment of Cleon for demagogy as a consequence of his proposal to execute the Mytileneans. This clearly assumes knowledge of Thucydides.⁴⁵ When Quintilian lists useful reading for prospective orators, he covers

⁴³ Cribiore (1996) 45–9; cf. Willis (1968) Table 4.

⁴⁴ See Appendices in Cribiore (1996).

⁴⁵ *POxy* 2400. For ancient teaching methods, see Marrou (1956) and Cribiore (1996) *passim*.

all major branches of literature but indicates the distinct contribution of each genre.⁴⁶

We have already noted that secondary authors are most interested in Ion's tragic fragments. This is reflected in their statements about the scope of his work and the epithets they attach to him. He has a considerable variety of epithets: ὁ Χίος is the most common, but others are related to genre: ποιητής and τραγικός (or variants, such as τραγωδοποιός), one reference as συγγραφεύς, "the (prose) writer".⁴⁷ Ion's tragic fragments are least likely to attract an epithet, in 33 per cent of instances (14 out of 42), compared to 64 per cent for his non-tragic poetry (10 out of 14), and 59 per cent for prose (16 out of 27). This implies that he was generally regarded as a tragedian—writers otherwise feeling obliged to supply some additional information. The general pattern is confirmed when only genre-specific epithets are considered. These are most common for Ion's prose works, 29 per cent (8 out of 27), apparently his least familiar field, compared to 21 per cent (9 out of 42) for tragedy and 14 per cent (2 out of 14) for non-tragic poetry.⁴⁸

There were forces which influenced the arrangement of literature into genres: this would not, in itself, have excluded Ion from the canon of preferred ancient authors. However, failing to find accommodation in some recognized category or tradition makes a text vulnerable. His *polyeideia*, though remarkable, may have contributed to the view that he lacked artistic seriousness.⁴⁹ The irony, of course, is that *polyeideia*

⁴⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.

⁴⁷ 125 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F21 = Phryn. *Ecl.* 286 Fischer; cf. 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10. On the meaning of *sungrapheus* see my chapter on "Ion the Wineman" (note 3) in this volume. There is further variety in the bio- and bibliographical sources (for example, φιλόσοφος: T4 Leurini = 36A3 DK = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios) and distinctions between types of poetry (see Pelling in this volume). I focus here on citations of fragments, excluding lexica and glossaries, which rarely use epithets (in order to save space).

⁴⁸ Of course, the data are not unequivocal. These sources refer to Ion by name alone in 52 per cent of all instances (43 out of 83), as ὁ Χίου 25 per cent (21 times), and with literary epithets 23 per cent (19 times). It is not the case that authors who cite Ion multiple times omit an epithet after the first instance. Plutarch and Philoponus do this, but the general practice is to use a set formula.

⁴⁹ Cf. Plutarch's suggestion that Ion could be frivolous (109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = *Per.* 5.3–4). There may have been a prejudice against *polyeideia*, at least in intellectual circles. Callimachus had to defend the variety of his work (see T15a Leurini = Callim. *Iamb.* 13, fr. 203 Pfeiffer; T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in Callim. *Iamb.* 13). The great polymath Eratosthenes was given the derisive nicknames *Beta* and *Pentathlos*. The pentathlete was a common metaphor for all-round competence but inferiority in

doubtless promotes literary creativity in the first place. Radical experiments may not be thought worth developing further, or may be eclipsed by later, better examples. Much of the current volume is concerned with the evidence of Ion's flair for innovation. As one example, the *Foundation of Chios* is the oldest known *Klisissagen* in prose. Its one direct quote—ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγῃς λόγῃς ποιεῖ πεντήκοντα (“He allotted fifty shares from the share of Teos”: 97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etyim. Or.* s.v. λόγῃ)—is reminiscent of Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen* for its pronounced alliteration. It may reflect a similar experiment in making the novel medium of prose effective and pleasing to a listener.⁵⁰

There are other examples where Ion's work does not seem to have entered traditions where perpetuating forces could come to bear. Ion wrote the *Triagmos* and made some remarks in his poetry about Pythagoras, astronomy and musicology.⁵¹ Modern scholarship often counts him as a Pythagorean. However, as Han Baltussen observes in this volume, no ancient source actually calls him a Pythagorean. He is only referred to as a *philosophos* once, by the *Suda*, and this may be an inference, as opposed to a reflection of ancient tradition (T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios). Ion was probably not included in any Pythagorean corpus or considered important in the philosophical tradition.⁵² Most of the fragments of the *Triagmos* are isolated from their context and preserved for reasons not related to their philosophical content. Plutarch cites 118* Leurini = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d; *Quaest. conv.* 717b as a gnomic saying along with other similar quotes: pithy, memorable, flexible in application and with a moralizing tone. Harpocration's notice of 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion (= Isoc. *Antid.* 268) is intended to explain Isocrates, and probably came ultimately from Callimachus' *Pinakes*.⁵³ 116 Leurini, which claims that

specific fields (Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.5; [Pl.] *Erastai* 135e ff.; [Longinus] *Subl.* 34.1). Criticism of jacks-of-all-trades from a philosophical perspective was widespread: Pl. *Rep.* 370b ff., 394e ff., *Laus* 846d–847a; Xen. *Mem.* 3.9.15, *Cyr.* 8.2.5–6; Arist. *Pol.* 1252b; Schol. Pl. *Tim.* 20a.

⁵⁰ The text is that of von Blumenthal (1939) fr. 19; cf. 97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etyim. Or.* s.v. λόγῃ and note 14 in my chapter “Ion the Wineman” in this volume. On the genre of the *Foundation of Chios*, see “Ion the Wineman” (note 3).

⁵¹ For example, 92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120; 93 Leurini = 32 West = Cleonid. *Isag. harm.* 12, p. 202 Jan = Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius *Harmonica* p. 116 Jonker; 95* Leurini = *TGrF* 19 F66a [= fr. eleg. 30A] = Philodem. *De piet.* p. 13 Gomperz.

⁵² Was the *Triagmos* a *paignion*? Dover (1986) 31.

⁵³ See note 30.

Pythagoras wrote poetry under Orpheus' name, appears in Clement of Alexandria (*Str.* 1.131) and Diogenes Laertius (D. L. 8.8) in near-identical language, presumably from a common source. It is bio-bibliographical trivia, not philosophy. Moreover, it seems to have been connected to Orpheus, not Pythagoras: at least, this is how Clement quotes it, and the datum ultimately appears—highly scrambled—attached to Orpheus' name in the *Suda*.⁵⁴

Two remaining fragments of the *Triagmos* are part of the doxographical tradition. Stobaeus cites 117* Leurini in a list of ancient philosophers' opinions on the moon's substance, size and shape. His source was probably Aëtius' (conjectured) *Placita* of the first or second century AD.⁵⁵ However, Stobaeus does not cite other potentially relevant items from the *Triagmos*—even though he seems to aim for comprehensiveness—such as 114 Leurini (above) and 115* Leurini (below) for his chapter on the number of elements or principles.⁵⁶ Hence, 117* Leurini seems to be an isolated item. The same is probably true for the sixth century Philoponus, who cites 115* Leurini twice in his commentary on Aristotle's *On Coming-to-be and Ceasing-to-be*, where he surveys the opinions of the ancients on the number of elements. Whatever his source—some earlier commentary or doxography—the line of transmission may not be direct. First, he gives two different versions of Ion's three elements: fire, earth, air and fire, earth, water.⁵⁷ This suggests that he or his source was relying on memory. Second, Ion's elements appear as part of a numerical sequence: one, two or three. This is determined by Aristotle's text but the jingle appears or is alluded to several times in ancient philosophical literature.⁵⁸ It is possible that the sequence preserved the data without depending on a direct written source. It is also possible that it arose independently on different occasions, and

⁵⁴ T9b Leurini = 36B2 DK = *FGrH* 392 F25c = *Suda* s.v. Orpheus [o 654].

⁵⁵ 117* Leurini = 36A7 DK = *Dox. Gr.* 356b21 + Stob. 1.26.1 W-H = Aët. *Plac.* 2.25.11. See Mansfeld and Runia (1997) especially pp. 319–32.

⁵⁶ Stob. 1.10. Other extant doxographies are polemics or highly compressed epitomes (Mansfeld and Runia 1997, especially pp. 182–95, 213–38, 276–84). I have already noted that Stobaeus would probably have been interested in 118* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F17a = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d; *Quaest. conv.* 717b.

⁵⁷ On 329a1: 115*(I) Leurini = 36A6 DK [second text] = *FGrH* 392 F24c = Philop. *De gen. et corr.*, p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli. On 330b17: see 115*(II) Leurini = Philop. *De gen. et corr.*, p. 227, 13–4 Vitelli.

⁵⁸ 114 Leurini = 36A6 DK [first text] = Isoc. *Antid.* 268; Pl. *Soph.* 242c; Arist. *De gen. et corr.* 329a1, 330b17; cf. *Top.* 105b15ff.; Aëtius 1.3.20; Sext. Emp. *Math.* 2.5 (310–318); Stob. 1.10.

particular data were introduced from the author's knowledge from both within and without the doxographical tradition. Indeed, these sequences are too varied in detail to represent a fixed item. Neither Stobaeus nor Philoponus actually name the *Triagmos*, which increases the likelihood that they knew Ion's fragments only from intermediary sources, already gleaned and isolated from context.

Conclusion

It seems that Ion was well regarded, if not popular, for a few centuries after his death but that his star was setting by the end of the Hellenistic period. Later periods were not interested in his works for their cultural or literary qualities—in any case, 'Longinus' expresses the view that he lacked real sublimity (T17 Leurini = *Subl.* 33.5)—but as a source for factoids.

There is an illustrative relationship between the papyrus record, which represents an author's popularity and dissemination, and his ultimate survival. Those authors and works best represented in papyri are usually the same as those that survive through to the Medieval period, and which we would regard as the most important. Of the sixteen authors best represented, thirteen appear in the medieval manuscript tradition.⁵⁹ There is an even stronger correspondence between the endurance of an author's appeal and his ultimate survival. When manuscripts are divided into periods—Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine—eleven authors appear in all three periods. All eleven we would consider major authors.⁶⁰ Of authors found in both Roman and Byzantine manuscripts, 70 per cent are extant. Authors attested in manuscripts from only one period are rarely extant; none who appear in Ptolemaic papyri alone. Lost authors decline in number fairly early on, and are rarely attested after the fourth century.⁶¹ Popularity, integration into the curriculum, and scholarly endorsement do not guarantee survival—Menander is the outstanding example. But Ion seems to have failed on all counts, and there were no other mechanisms to promote his survival, such as sustained parochial interest or a school to preserve his memory.

⁵⁹ Willis (1968) Table 4.

⁶⁰ Menander now is represented in a recently discovered manuscript in the Vatican.

⁶¹ Willis (1968) 214–6 and Table 5.

At the beginning of this paper, I mentioned the processes by which a text could be disseminated. This could be regarded as its 'birth rate', with a corresponding 'death rate'—destruction through wear and tear, accidents, and natural and man-made disasters. John Cisne suggests that demographic models can describe manuscript populations. This could even be extended to a Darwinian model: texts survive according to their fitness to the intellectual and cultural environment. Naturally, there are limitations to this analogy. It works best for a fair-sized population, whereas a text can survive through only one manuscript. It assumes a constant rate of destruction, a more-or-less unchanging environment, and a closed population, though the classical and medieval worlds experienced major changes and disruptions, and some texts survived outside it altogether. It also ignores the role of textual fragments.⁶² Perhaps these could be regarded as genes, even redundant genes, reproduced along with the host whether or not they contribute to its survival abilities.

The adoption of more easily written and read scripts, more durable materials (parchment in place of papyri), and cheaper and handier formats (codices outnumbered scrolls by the fourth century AD) improve texts' rate of survival.⁶³ On the other hand, they also tend to make less popular texts, unlikely candidates for transcription, even less accessible. Similarly, while the existence of libraries facilitates copying, this does not necessarily happen. Libraries concentrate texts as much as disseminate them. Collections often come about through gifts, bequests, bulk purchases and thefts, not from copying.⁶⁴ The concentration of texts makes localized disasters especially devastating. The destruction of the Library of Alexandria is the famous example.

The period before the start of systematic collection of texts in Alexandria could be called the first crisis of classical literary culture. A second crisis occurred towards the end of the Roman period, the mid-third to the late fourth centuries, a period of economic, social and political turmoil, when there is evidence for a decline in literacy and the use and importance of writing. Literature declined in range and quantity. Lactantius in the late third century seems to have read no Greek literature directly, and surprisingly little Latin prose, including

⁶² Cisne (2005); critique in Gilman and Glaze (2005).

⁶³ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 34–6, 59–60.

⁶⁴ For example, Cic. *Att.* 1.20.7, 2.1.12; Plut. *Luc.* 42, *Ant.* 58; Paulus *Sent.* 3.6.51; Marshall (1976) 254–60.

Cicero. Libanius could not find a copy of Aelius Aristides in Laodicea in the fourth century, nor Augustine Cicero in Hippo in the fifth.⁶⁵ A third crisis occurred during the sixth to eighth centuries: the cumulative effect of centuries of disruption and the appearance of new populations with no tradition of contact with classical culture. In the West, few texts were produced at all, and almost none classical. Knowledge of Greek was rare.⁶⁶ In the Byzantine Empire, a combination of natural disasters, warfare and the politics of religion destroyed the centres of culture outside the capital. Some now-lost works survived, as Photius' *Bibliotheca* shows, but most of the losses had already occurred, including such once widespread authors as Menander.⁶⁷

Using Ion as a case-study in the history of preservation of classical literature has emphasized the importance of on-going cultural relevance. Authors are preserved and disseminated when readers find in them something of value—this is a function of cultural conditions, literary tastes and intellectual demands. Its dependence on the existence of certain institutions is critical. The major area of loss in Ion's corpus may be lyric poetry.⁶⁸ The bare handful of verses we have must be a small proportion of the total. Perhaps little was published in the first place: the sympotic environment especially was prone to changes in taste and social practice, and therefore not conducive to preservation. New literary forms, experiments in style, and *paignia* are likely to be rejected or ignored, so Ion's prose works were probably regarded as trivia or oddities. However, the importance of tragedy throughout the classical period may have maintained interest in Ion's dramas, whether or not they were actually performed.⁶⁹ Indeed, if success is relative, Ion is more than respectable. Famous tragedians, such as Phrynichus, Agathon, Critias and Astydamas the younger, are quite poorly attested. *TrGF* attributes 56 fragments to Achaëus I and 43 to Chaeremon, but Ion is the best represented of all lost tragedians with 68.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Willis (1968) Table 3; Lib. *Ep.* 1262; August. *Ep.* 118.9; cf. Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 9.9.6–8; Norman (1960); Harris (1989) 297–316; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 31–3.

⁶⁶ Reynolds (1983) xv–xvii; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 79–86, 118–21.

⁶⁷ Wilson (1967) 63–78; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 51–4, 58–65.

⁶⁸ Of course, of ancient lyricists, only Pindar has any poems survive in manuscripts.

⁶⁹ Old plays were still performed (in some form) certainly in the third century AD, and perhaps as late as the sixth century: Green (1994) 161–2. However, only Euripides and Menander are actually attested after the second century BC. See note 33 above and Jones (1993).

⁷⁰ 81 in Leurini, 78 in von Blumenthal.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE POET AND THE PLACE: A MODERN CHIAN PERSPECTIVE ON ION OF CHIOS AND HIS HOME ISLAND

NIKOS K. HAVIARAS

The relationship between a poet and his hometown has ever been strong. Given the prominent status a poet enjoyed among his fellow-citizens in Greek antiquity—and most poets were fully aware of this and took advantage of it—there developed a convention that a poet could promote the prestige of his hometown through the power of his art. Even if the status of a Greek city was at a low ebb and did not merit any praise during a certain period, the poet could always draw upon a relatively more glorious past. Indeed there is plenty of evidence for praise of home cities by local poets: for instance, Pindar and Bacchylides did not miss any opportunity to eulogize their home towns, Thebes and Ceos respectively; Sophocles and Euripides devoted some of their finest verses to extol Athens' virtues.¹

Regardless of the scanty remains of Ion's work, and given that we have relatively sufficient biographical information on him,² it becomes obvious that he was a poet closely connected to his hometown of Chios. He may have gained fame in antiquity through his tragedies, but it seems that he served a lot of literary genres. In at least two of his works, he treats the founding of Chios and the origins of his fellow-citizens. Chios' founding hero was the Cretan Oinopion, the son of Dionysus and Ariadne,³ and Ion likely narrated the story of the founding of

¹ For instance, Pind. *Isthm.* 7.1–9; Soph. *OC* 668–719; Eur. *Med.* 825ff. To avoid any potential confusion caused by these examples, it should be noted that the circumstances of a 'professional' poet—one who composed for a particular patron and developed, through years of personal and financial relationship, a special link with an individual, a family or a broader community—are different, and irrelevant to the scope of this paper. For a good discussion of these issues, see Thummer (1968) 55–65.

² See von Blumenthal (1939) 1–3; Jacoby (1947a); Huxley (1965).

³ Consider the account of the Chian historian Theopompus (*FGH* 115 F276): "it is said that dark wine was first created by the Chians and also they were the first who

Chios in his *Chiou Klisis*, a work of prose dealing with the history of Chios.⁴ The passage, preserved by Pausanias, is as follows:

The tragic poet Ion, in a work of his, has written the following: Poseidon came to the still uninhabited island and paired off with a nymph; at the time the nymph was in travail, it started snowing (χιόνα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πεσεῖν) and due to this, Poseidon gave to the baby boy the name Chios; then the god married another nymph and had two more sons, Agelos and Melas; time went by, and Oinopion arrived with ships at Chios from Crete, together with his sons Talos and Euanthes and Melas and Salagos and Athamas. During Oinopion's reign, Carians and Abantes from Euboea came to Chios. And after Oinopion and his sons, Amphiklos came to power; he had come from Histiaea in Euboea, according to an oracle from Delphi. Hector, fourth descendant of Amphiklos—he became a king [of Chios] as well—made war against the Abantes and the Carians who lived on the island; he killed some of them in battles, and forced others to leave [Chios] under a truce. When the war at Chios came to an end, Hector thought that his people should offer sacrifices together with the Ionians at the Panionion. It is said that he received a tripod as a prize for his valour from the Ionians. Such were the things that I discovered that Ion had written about the Chians; however, he did not say anything as to the reason that the Chians are classed as Ionians.

(98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10)⁵

Now some remarks: first, it is interesting that the twentieth century historian of Chios, G. Zolotas, notes that Ion links the history of Chios to Poseidon.⁶ Poseidon was the protector of the Ionians, and one of the two Olympian gods who struggled to take Athens under their auspices; the other—and the eventual victor—was Athena. Secondly, as his last words demonstrate, Pausanias could not find in Ion's account any cast-iron proof for the Ionian origin of the Chians.

In our fragment, Ion does not refer at all to Oinopion's parentage. However, in a verse fragment (that is, from a different work), the poet speaks of Chios as having been founded by Oinopion, son of Theseus.⁷

learned how to plant and cultivate vines from Oinopion, the son of Dionysus, who was the first who inhabited the island, and then they showed this to other people".

⁴ Pausanias uses the word *sungraphe* for the *Chiou Klisis*, a term used of prose documents, and there is no reason to suppose that the periegete was mistaken. Cf. Dover (1986) 32.

⁵ All English translations are my own.

⁶ Zolotas (1921) 1.1: 17.

⁷ 96* Leurini = 29 West = Plut. *Thes.* 20.2: τὴν ποτε Θησείδης ἔκτισεν Οἰνοπίων. Cf. also the local inscription (with lists of Oinopion's family and followers) published by Contoléon (1949) 5–9.

Plutarch, to whom we owe this fragment, did not elaborate on whether this was an invention by Ion, or whether the Chian poet was merely conveying and reinforcing a common local belief.

The issue of Oinopion's parentage, though, bears special significance. Ion, a prominent member of the pro-Athenian party on Chios (see below), had decided to deal with the Ionian origins of the Chians.⁸ Because of his political views, he attempted to show that his fellow-countrymen were 'relatives' of the Athenians—thus justifying the devotion of fifth century Chios to Athens. Therefore, an even stronger argument in favour of a close and long-lasting connection between Chios and Athens certainly would have been the establishment of a relationship between the Chians and Athenian heroic mythology, channelled through the figure of Theseus—indubitably one of the greatest members of the Athenian heroic pantheon, despite being a figure with little representation in myth, legend and cult outside of Athens.⁹ It was Cimon, no less, a friend of Ion's family, who was connected to Theseus,¹⁰ thus affording sufficient ground for political propaganda: a skilful poet could manipulate this connection in order to serve Athenian imperialism. I hypothesize: if we can accept Barron's dating of the composition of the *Chiou Ktisis* "no earlier than the mid-460s",¹¹ a date which is consonant with the early, "foundation phase" of Greek historiography,¹² then we might consider a later date for Ion's other work on Oinopion which furnishes the Theseus version. A probable date for the latter would be after Ion's establishment of strong links with Athens (and Cimon in particular), after his meeting with Sophocles in 440 (see below), and possibly shortly before or after the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. The second dating option coincides with Ion's successes at the dramatic festivals in Athens. In a period when both parties sought a deeper relationship, Ion offered his group in Chios a theoretical basis to warrant their devotion to Athens, and his Athenian

⁸ A rather hazy issue—see Zolotas (1921) 1.1: 44ff. In my opinion, though, it is likely that Ion would have dealt with the Ionian origin of the Chians in the *Chiou Ktisis*.

⁹ So Barron (1986) 92. However, Sarikakis (1998) 281–306, in his Appendix on the cults of Chios, does not record any evidence of a Theseus cult on Chios.

¹⁰ For the relationship between Cimon and Ion's father, as well as for Cimon as a descendant of Theseus, see Barron (1986) 93–4 (with bibliography).

¹¹ Barron (1986) 92.

¹² Cf. Dover (1986) 32; Barron (1986) 93.

friends a point of reference to their illustrious ancestors who had managed to acquire allies among the richest Greek cities.¹³

Ion probably inherited his love of Athens from his father Orthomenes, who had been Cimon's comrade-in-arms, and who had been given the nickname Xuthus. This is not without significance, since Xuthus was the name of the father of the mythical hero Ion, the eponymous patriarch of the Ionians.¹⁴ Perhaps Orthomenes named his son Ion precisely for this reason;¹⁵ then Ion 'bequeathed' pro-Athenianism to his own son Tydeus (a mythic name again), whose execution during the winter of 413/2 at the hands of the Spartan commander of Chios marked the end of an era of pro-Athenianism on the island.¹⁶

Already in antiquity, due to Greece's specific geographical structure—with mountain ranges constituting often impenetrable borders and, certainly, the numerous islands—an intensely sectional spirit was shaped, and the inhabitants of several parts of the country were reputed to have developed a peculiar character and mentality. This is still obvious nowadays in the mockeries which one province or island directs towards another. With regard to the Chians, the following characteristics are noted: prudence to the point of conservatism; cheerfulness; variety of interests and cosmopolitanism—these final two likely emerging as a consequence of their sea-faring pursuits.¹⁷ Thucydides notes that the Chians were the only Greeks, apart from the Spartans, who combined prosperity with prudence.¹⁸ Accordingly, A. Koraes, the great Chiot of the Age of Enlightenment, noted that the Chians can deal with serious matters even while joking and laughing.¹⁹ It seems that Ion, who lived and prospered during exactly the period to which Thucydides refers, was indeed a representative sample of this Chian mentality.

With the exclusion of the uneasy last years of the Peloponnesian war, fifth century Chios was rich and prosperous, and one of the most

¹³ I discuss an analogous case (Aias' incorporation into Athenian mythology) in Haviaras (1993) 18–33. Cf. also Barron (1986) 94.

¹⁴ Hdt. 1.146.1; Paus. 7.4.2–3.

¹⁵ Barron (1986) 91; see also Sarikakis (1989) 361, 435.

¹⁶ Cf. T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3; see Barron (1986) 101–2 (with n66), where he also makes two interesting (if far-fetched) conjectures: (1) the aged Ion negotiated the assurances between Athens and Chios in 425; (2) a Chiot Achilles, honoured by the Athenians in the same year, was a son of Ion.

¹⁷ See, especially, Sarikakis (1986) 121–31.

¹⁸ Thuc. 8.24.4; cf. also 8.15.1, 40.1, 45.4.

¹⁹ Cf. Koraes (1811) 1: β'; also (1978) 26.

important and loyal allies of Athens from 478 until 412.²⁰ Ion was the author of *Epidemiai* ("Journeys" or "Visits"); it is generally considered semi-historical—Ion was certainly the first Greek to write "memoirs" of this sort.²¹ The account of his meeting with Sophocles, when the Athenian tragedian visited Chios, is cited by Athenaeus in a well-known passage.²² Sophocles accompanied Pericles on the Athenian expedition against Samos (440/439); it seems that Pericles, realizing that the tragic poet, newly elected as general after his triumph with the *Antigone*, might have been more useful as a diplomat than a man of warlike action, sent him to Chios and Lesbos, neighbouring allies, to ensure extra help. The rich Chiot and prominent pro-Athenian politician Hermesilaos (*proxenos* of Athens in Chios) gave a reception at his house in honour of the famous guest, where Sophocles was enthralled by a good-looking boy who was pouring the wine. The scene ends with Sophocles tricking the boy into a kiss—to the applause of all.

The spirit of the reception reflects the famous Chian hospitality and joyful atmosphere which Ion recorded as relished by all. It is possible that during this occasion the relationship between Ion and Athens, and also between Ion and Sophocles, gained momentum; this relationship would prove strong in the future. Things work in the same way even nowadays...

However, what fascinates us, since Athenaeus in general follows his sources closely, is the vivid and playful presentation of the incident—a revelation into the nature and the style of the author. Even if Ion concentrated on his *own* visits and journeys in the *Epidemiai*, rather than those of his famous contemporaries, it appears that we have lost a unique piece of work.

The fact that he staged his plays in Athens demonstrates the close links between Ion, Chios and Athens. We know that Ion came third at the Dionysia of 428, when Euripides won with the *Hippolytus*.²³ The fact that Ion came first, at least once, shows that he was very well known in Athens and, given the high expectations of Athenian audiences at the dramatic competitions, the plays with which he competed must

²⁰ Cf. Ar. *Birds* 880: "I like this practice of always adding the Chians"; also Eupolis' *Poleis* F246 PCG; see Barron (1986) 102 and Blanshard in this volume.

²¹ Certainly before Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. For the original and the unique nature of this work, see Dover (1986) 34–5.

²² 104 Leurini = FG⁺H 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d. For more details of the incident, see Sarikakis (1989) 157; Quinn (1981) 40 (with n4).

²³ T6 Leurini = TrGF DID C 13 = FG⁺H 392 T6 = Argum. Eur. *Hipp.* 2.

have been of the highest standard. The year/s of any victories remain speculative.²⁴ The most memorable detail of his victory was that Ion, thoroughly delighted, apparently gave every one of the spectators a jar of Chian wine as a gift. This gesture undoubtedly indicates, apart from pride and gratitude, financial affluence on Ion's part.

It is worth elaborating on the topic of Chian wine. It was considered one of the best in ancient Greece: certainly it was the most renowned product of the island in antiquity, and its main source of wealth and reputation. Wine is curiously, but at the same time closely, connected with the founding of Chios (as Olding elaborates in this volume). The name of Chios' founder Oinopion literally means "one who drinks wine", and it has been suggested that the names of the five sons of Oinopion represented the different qualities of Chian wine.²⁵ Furthermore, a cult of Dionysus, god of wine, seems to have been prominent on ancient Chios.²⁶ It seems that Ion's frequent references to wine and its god confirm his genuine love for the prized product of his country. One might even presume that Ion participated in activities connected to the cult of Dionysus on Chios.

Two lines from elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d are a case in point. In these lines, Ion idealizes the merits of wine drinking—and in the process may reveal something about his own personality and character. Wine is called "inspirer of good deeds", and the pursuits one should follow after drinking are delineated with remarkable clarity: drinking, having fun, and thinking justly (lines 15–16). Wine is seen (if drunk in reasonable quantity) as clarifying human thought and assisting one to reach right decisions (see Katsaros in this volume). There are traces of broader ethical issues in these lines.²⁷

²⁴ The decade 435–425 is the most likely.

²⁵ So Zolotas (1921) 1.1: 21–2. Oinopion's name comes from οἶνος and π[ι][ν]ω (Barron 1986: 94); Zolotas (1921) 1.1: 20 differs, deriving Oinopion's name from οἶνωψ, "wine-faced, wine-dark". For a detailed survey of Chian wine, see Spanos (1966). It is worth noting that Ion in his *Chiou Ktisis* referred to the local practice of mixing wine and water in certain set proportions: 99 Leurini = *FGH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e.

²⁶ Sarikakis (1998) 289–91. For the early appearance of Dionysus as a Greek god, see Karetsou (2002) xxv.

²⁷ The tantalizing subject of Ion as a philosopher—since Ion, as a Chiot, resided close to Asia Minor/Ionia, the cradle of Greek philosophy—lies outside the scope of this paper; see the apt remarks of Dover (1986) 28–32. Note, in particular, the similar vocabulary employed by Ion in 89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d and Empedocles 31B129.3 DK: Dover (1986) 31.

Ion's great colleague and friend, Sophocles, was considered already in antiquity to be the *homerikotatos* among all poets.²⁸ Ion himself was raised with a heightened awareness of Chios' intrinsic Homeric tradition, and appears to have followed the call. Even if our scanty remains reveal but part of the truth, it is obvious that Ion's tragedies exhibit a strongly Homeric influence. We know eleven titles of Ion's dramas, and six appear to derive from the rich foundations of the Trojan Cycle: *Agamemnon*, *Argeioi*, *Laertes*, *Teukros*, *Phoenix*, *Phrouroi*. Moreover, the archaic style and the richly Ionian vocabulary used by Ion may again reflect Homeric influence (see, for example, Stevens in this volume).²⁹

A very interesting detail reveals an on-going linguistic relationship between Ion's fragments and contemporary local vocabulary in rural Chios. In *Argeioi* 11 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F9 = Hsch. σ 224, we find an uncertain reading of the last word: ὡς παλαιὸν †ακίς σάρων. The manuscript reading is ἀκίσσαρον—that is, “like an old ἀκίσσαρον”: useless, due to old age, according to the gloss of Hesychius. The word *akissaros* is still the name of a bush in the villages of NE Chios, the branch of which is used as a broom, in order to give the house a good sweep-out. Therefore the suggested reading ἀκίσσαρον becomes more plausible—as Olding and Blanshard note in this volume, Ion favours some Chian words. Despite the nowadays common nature of the ὀρίγανον in the rocky hills of Chios, it may be going too far to consider any local significance of its use in the surviving single line of Ion's elegy 91 Leurini = 28 West = Ath. 68b; Choerob. *ap. Et. Gen.* s.v. ὀρίγανον: αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἐμπαπέως τὸν ὀρίγανον ἐν χερὶ κεύθει, “For he quickly hides the oregano in his hand”!

Let me conclude by offering an account of Ion's survival through the centuries, from ancient to contemporary Chios. Leon Allatios (Allacci), an important seventeenth century scholar with a first-class reputation in Europe, of Chian origins but mainly active in Italy, mentions Ion in his poem *Hellas* (1642). In archaic iambic verses, Allatios praises his home island, now fallen into slavery, and catalogues the prominent figures of ancient Chios as follows:

²⁸ See, for instance, Kirkwood (1965); Easterling (1984); Davidson (1988); Perysinakis (1992), especially pp. 79–82.

²⁹ So Dover (1986) 30, 32; these characteristics are to be found throughout Ion's varied corpus.

Amongst all islands, to me you are the richest,
 putting your foundations deep into the sea.
 For in old times you offered
 will, word, and prudence, and skilful men
 numerous: Metrodorus, Theocritus,
 Scymnus, *Ion*, Oinopides, Democritus,
 I keep silent about Theopompus, and, apart from them,
 the mouth of the Muses, Homer, through which he produced
 a song envied by gods, not only by men.

Further, Pheraios Rhegas, in the representation of Chios in his *Χάρτα τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (1797), mentions *Ion* among the four greatest literary figures of ancient Chios (the other three are Homer, Theopompus and Theocritus).

Scarlatos Manganas, in his epic poem *Chias* (1895), narrates, in Homeric style, the history of Chios from mythological times until the devastating earthquake of 1881. He writes:

either like Herodotus, *Ion*, Thucydides,
 or my Homer, the Chiot peer.

In a recent publication of a children's book in English, *Ion's* version of the founding and naming of Chios is narrated:³⁰

In antiquity there lived in Chios a tragic poet by the name of *Ion*. Once upon a time, *Ion* says, the god Poseidon came to the island which was then uninhabited. There, in the midst of the desert, Poseidon found a beautiful nymph and married her.

Some months later, the bride was expecting a child. And on a snowy, winter day she gave birth to a handsome little boy. The father, Poseidon, named his son Chios, from the word 'chion' meaning 'snow'.

Years went by and Chios grew up. During one of his journeys, Plutarch tells us, Chios found the treasure of the rich Lydian King Croesus. Without being noticed he started removing the king's gold a little at a time and distributing it to his fellow countrymen. But one day, the guards caught him stealing and arrested him. Unable to escape and not wanting to put the blame on his own people, Chios fell into the river and drowned.

* * *

³⁰ Fafalios (1990) 13.

The purpose of this paper is not to evaluate Ion or, moreover, to challenge long-standing views of literary criticism about him.³¹ Ion's surviving fragments, as well as the high esteem he appears to have enjoyed from contemporary and later Greek writers, seem to justify the view that he was one of those 'great minors', capriciously dealt with by the goddess of literature Tyche: we cannot know with any certainty whether Ion influenced any genre decisively, but it is tantalizing to speculate on the remains of his work. The variety and the style of his work reflects a playful and versatile spirit—we detect a pleasant and attractive character, all too human,³² enjoying philosophical interests and a marked sense of moderation. Friend of honest joys and pleasures, at the same time serving his home town to the best of his abilities, he was representative of the 'good' citizen of fifth century Chios and the wider Greek world. Any Chian should stand thoughtfully over the remains of his work, mourning what is lost, but nevertheless appreciating his achievements.

What, then, of the attitude of contemporary Chios towards Ion? Unfortunately, contemporary Chios seems to ignore him. Most pupils, even in High Schools, have never heard of him. Nowhere is any statue erected to him—two busts of Homer adorn Chios Town, which has a Public Garden displaying busts of all important (and sometimes unimportant!) literary figures of the Chian past. There is only a dead end street named after Ion in the town: a mere 60 metres long, running perpendicular to the grander Theopompou Street. Ion of Chios still awaits recognition from his fellow-townsmen.³³

³¹ See, for instance, T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = [Longinus] *On the Sublime* 33.5.

³² Ion was called a lover of drink and very amorous (φιλοπότης and ἐρωτικώτατος) by his biographer Baton of Sinope: T21a, 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f; cf. T21b Leurini = Ael. *VH* 2.41.

³³ I would like to thank Professor Pat Easterling, Dr K. J. Dabos and Dr G. M. Mais-tros, as well as the Editors, for their help concerning the presentation of this paper.

PART TWO

ION *SUNGRAPHEOS*

CHAPTER FIVE

ION'S *EPIDEMIAI* AND PLUTARCH'S ION

CHRISTOPHER PELLING

Ion and genre

It is hard not to approach Ion of Chios back to front. We have only scraps of his own work; what we have is what has been chosen for quotation by later writers, so immediately we are dealing, not with the man himself in his own intellectual context, but with what later authors found interesting about him in theirs. When we try to recreate that contemporary context, we need to remember how little we know both about Ion and about that fifth century intellectual world. We can, if we choose, try big generalizations about what issues the Athenian empire must have raised for an islander, or what opportunities and attractions the Athenian cultural honeypot must have offered to an intellectual, or what literary forms must have suggested themselves most naturally to an enterprising author; indeed, I shall try some of them myself in a moment. But we should also remember how scarce and selective are our materials for reconstructing this period. There is a certain amount on some sorts of literary production, but not many, in Athens itself, and what we have is skewed towards the theatre; there are signs of vigorous and enterprising experiments in prose, with only a small fraction of these happening in Athens; we have just the sketchiest idea of even the main political events between the two great wars, with most of the colour owed to, and extremely filtered by, a talented writer composing with interests and agenda of his own nearly six hundred years later. Because this is 'classical', we somehow think we must understand it better than other periods; but there is a real sense in which we understand the intellectual (perhaps even the political) life of second century AD Greece better than the middle fifty years of the fifth century BC, and know more about the Second Sophistic than the First. Even for Ion, it will be useful later in this chapter to explore that second century AD intellectual background, even if it is the background to those who quote him rather than to the man himself.

Even through the haze, we can see that Ion was a fascinating and important figure, fascinating enough to justify a book about him. But *how* he was fascinating and important is more difficult to pin down (another reason to justify a book about him!)—how remarkable it was, for instance, for a man from an allied city to contend in the tragic competition against the great Athenian poets. And here again it is hard not to read his importance backwards, to identify later developments that seem to stand in a generic line of descent from Ion, or simply to show a family resemblance, and read back later features into Ion himself. That is particularly tempting with the genre of biography, as we shall see; but it is not just a matter of biography. Dover, for instance, sees Ion's *Epidemiai* as a forerunner of Xenophon's *Apomnemonemata*, with Ion himself as the "connecting thread" in the same way as Socrates was to be in Xenophon's work: "Ion constructed a new literary form out of two oral forms, narrative conversation and the sayings of wise men".¹ That may be so; but even the scanty fragments we have do not particularly concentrate on "the sayings of wise men" to the same degree as Xenophon's collection, even though such *bons mots* were precisely the sort of material that Plutarch would find conveniently quotable (as some of the fragments we do have show). Conversation and sympotic behaviour, yes; wise sayings, less so. And yes, it must be that Ion's presence was some sort of "connecting thread": we can infer that from the very title *Epidemiai*, whether or not it was Ion's own—not so much *Travels*² or even *Visits*,³ but more *Spells of Residence* or *Stays*,⁴ periods of being 'at home' in a particular place.⁵ The plural doubtless

¹ Dover (1986) 32–5: "connecting thread" (p. 33); "two oral forms" (p. 34).

² Ostwald (1992) 325; "what might be called his 'Travel Pictures'": Misch (1950) 1.98; "Reisen": von Blumenthal (1939) 2; "Reiseerinnerungen": Meister (1978) 292; "Reisebilder bzw.—erinnerungen": Zimmermann (1998) 1075.

³ For example, Pelling in *OCD*³ s.v. biography, Greek; Brown in *OCD*³ s.v. Ion (2).

⁴ "Anwesenheiten": von Fritz (1967) 1.99; "Reiseaufenthalte": Strasburger (1986) 1 = (1990) 341.

⁵ Thus ἐπιδημεῖν is used naturally of diseases that are endemic, permanently at home at a place. That use is much more frequent than LSJ's single citation (*Progn.* 25) s.v. ἐπιδημέω I.2 would suggest: for example, [Hipp.] *Airs, Waters, Places* 4, *Internal Disorders* 20 bis, 21, and 37, and of course *Epid.* When applied to people, the 'being at home' aspect makes it natural to contrast ἐπιδημεῖν and ἀποδημεῖν, 'being at home' and 'being away': for example, Xen. *Symp.* 4.31, *Cyr.* 7.5.69. When *xenoi* are *epidemiai*, they usually seem to be more than temporary visitors (for example, Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.61, Pl. *Prot.* 342c7, and perhaps Lys. 12.35 and Hdt. 2.39.2, though on this last case Jacoby (1947a) 15 = (1956) 166 has doubts); when sophists come to ἐπιδημεῖν, it seems it is for more than a short visit (for example, Pl. *Prot.* 310e5, 315c8, *Apol.* 20a3, *Hipp. mai.* 282de, and Plato's own spells in Sicily, *Ep.* 7.330b8, 338e bis). The most temporary

suggests more than one place where Ion was at home, but not necessarily more than two: if he lived at some times at Chios and at some times in Athens, he would have had multiple *epidemiai* in both.⁶ But that can be a very different sort of connecting thread from anything we see in Xenophon. One striking feature in what we have of Ion is the absence of an 'I' perspective. For an author so often linked with the development of an interest in personality or the individual, he tells us—even indirectly suggests to us—very little about himself.⁷ This is not about him, it is about the people he met, whereas the “connecting thread” in Xenophon is very much the person that the *Apomnemonemata* are about, the dominating figure Socrates. And the same goes for those scholars who, very reasonably, see Ion as a forerunner of the lively *mises-en-scène* of the Platonic dialogue:⁸ a forerunner, yes, but a forerunner with that important difference, the absence of a single dominating figure.

We are already talking about ‘genres’, and different sorts of later literature that seem to have Ion among their early exponents. Unsurprisingly, the generic versatility of Ion is one thing that struck later readers in antiquity, just as it has ever since. *Suda* describes him as “a tragic poet and a lyric poet and a philosopher”,⁹ and Harpocration says that “he wrote a lot: choral songs and tragedies and a work of philosophy called *Triagmos*”.¹⁰ The scholiast on Aristophanes *Peace* 835 calls him “a poet of dithyrambs and tragedy and choral songs” and adds that “he also wrote comedies and epigrams and paeans and hymns and scolia and encomia and elegies, and in prose the so-called *Presbeutikos*

epidemia in a fifth century author seems to be ‘Old Oligarch’ 1.18, where it is used of allies coming to Athens for law-suits: those too could be fairly long-drawn-out affairs. In the age of Demosthenes, there is talk of more temporary *epidemiai*, especially for festivals: LSJ s.v. ἐπιδημέω III. The fifth century range of the word is a good reason for not taking the title to suggest other people’s *epidemiai* at Chios: great men would visit the island, but would not be ‘at home’ for an extended period. The Sophocles anecdote (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d, below) is set in Chios, but it was Ion, not Sophocles, who was at home there.

⁶ It is quite likely, though, that 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23, his meeting with Socrates at Samos, suggests a stay of Ion himself there: so West (1985) 73. See Fletcher in this volume.

⁷ That is a qualification of Momigliano (1993) 30: “...his tale was of a definite autobiographical character”; at least as a modern would naturally take “autobiographical character”, that is less clearly true of Ion than of many earlier poetic texts.

⁸ West (1985); Strasburger (1986) 8 = (1990) 348.

⁹ T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* [1 487] s.v. Ion Chios.

¹⁰ T9a, 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion.

(but some say that is not authentic); also surviving is his *Foundation* <of Chios> and his *Cosmology* and his *Memoirs* and some others”.¹¹

Yet would Ion have regarded himself—would he even have had the vocabulary to describe himself—as ‘generically versatile’? He is more likely to have classed himself, as Plutarch sometimes classes him, as simply ‘poet’, expecting that a good poet would be active over a number of what we call genres—just as Pindar’s work ranges over epinicia, paeans, dithyrambs, hymns, encomia and a good deal more; just as Simonides composed epigrams, dithyrambs, epinicia, laments, paeans, encomia, and different types of elegy; just as Euripides wrote epinicia and epigrams as well as plays (*TrGF* vol. 5.1, 90–95), and Aeschylus is said to have written elegies (*TrGF* vol. 3, T A 2) and Sophocles elegy, paeans, and prose (*TrGF* vol. 4, T A 2); and just as Plato himself wrote poetry as well as philosophy and could talk of Hippias of Elis as the author of “poems and epics and tragedies and dithyrambs and many works in prose of all sorts” (*Hipp. min.* 368c8–d2 = 86A12 DK; elegies too, we might add: Paus. 5.25.4 = 86B1 DK). Ion remains an extreme case, the right person for Callimachus to appeal to in his thirteenth *Iambus* in defence of his own *polyeideia*:¹² extreme, indeed, but not altogether “an exceptional phenomenon”.¹³ Such range was not an innovation of Hellenistic poets: that, indeed, was Callimachus’ point.

Fifth century prose writers similarly addressed a range of themes, and presumably adopted different strategies and registers. Hippias’ collection of Olympic victors must have been very different from his astronomical and his mathematical works, and both very different from his orations that “charmed the Greeks” (Philostr. *VS* 1.11.7); Prodicus’ work on language must have been of a different stamp from his account

¹¹ T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835.

¹² West (1985) 71. On Callimachus [T15a Leurini = Callim. *Iamb.* 13, fr. 203 Pfeiffer; T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in *Callim. Iamb.* 13; Pfeiffer (1949) 205f.] see now Hunter (1997) 41–7; Kerkhecker (1999) 250–70; and Henderson in this volume. Both Hunter (pp. 46–7) and Kerkhecker (pp. 261–2) explore the ways in which Callimachus is also in dialogue with Plato’s *Ion* (below), with a learned playfulness in combining the two homonyms in a context where Callimachus’ lack of ‘Ionian’ experience but use of ‘Ionic’ dialect are also in point. If so, as Kerkhecker says, Callimachus implies that his poetry is a genuine *technē*, and he can therefore fulfil Plato’s expectation that the proper poet (unlike the deficient real-life poets who are only good at one genre) should be able to perform in many genres.

¹³ “*Eine Ausnahmerscheinung*”: Zimmermann (1998) 1075.

of the Choice of Heracles,¹⁴ just as Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is very different from his *Hellenica*. Nor is such a range over both prose and verse so surprising, though it remains impressive. Critias wrote tragedies, satyr plays, elegies, and hexameter verse, as well as prose speeches, "conversations", a discussion of "the nature of love or virtues", and constitutions in both prose and verse (DK 88);¹⁵ and we should again remember Hippias and Sophocles and Plato. What requires comment in the fifth century is not generic range, but generic narrowing: the way, for instance, that—at least if we were to believe Plato—poets are typically much better at one genre than at others (one notices that he does not say that poets only *try* one genre, *Ion* 534c1–4);¹⁶ or the way that tragedy and comedy do not seem to be combined (except, perhaps, by Ion of Chios himself),¹⁷ and that, presumably, is why it raises an issue interesting enough to be raised so enigmatically at the end of Plato's *Symposium*.¹⁸

¹⁴ On Hippias' orations cf. Pl. *Hipp. mai.* 281a, *Hipp. min.* 346a, 363c (86A6–8 DK). Heracles at the cross-roads figured in Prodicus' *Horai* according to Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 361 = 84B1 DK: see Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21–34 = Prodicus 84B2 DK with Sansone (2004).

¹⁵ Critias has suddenly leapt into scholarly interest ("The time to stop forgetting Critias has, apparently, arrived": Wilson 2004b, citing Centanni 1997, Bultrighini 1999, Iannucci 2002 and Wilson 2003).

¹⁶ "Each person can only make a good job of composing (ποιεῖν καλῶς) the sort of poetry to which the Muse propels him, one man dithyrambs, another encomia, another *hyporchemata*, another epics, another iambics: in all other sorts each writer is poor (φάδλος)" (534c1–4). Despite the ready acquiescence of Plato's Ion, this claim is anyway outrageous: Pindar and Simonides are enough to show that.

¹⁷ That is what the scholiast on Aristophanes *Peace* 835 claims, but that has been doubted. Schol. *Frogs* 83–4 (*TGrF* 39 T12) claims that Agathon wrote comedies as well as tragedies, but this is usually thought to be a misunderstanding: at the end of Plato's *Symposium* (see next note), Socrates is urging Agathon and Aristophanes that the same man ought to be able to write both, and Agathon would scarcely need much persuading if he *did* write both (or, more precisely, if he was known to have already written both at the dramatic date of the dialogue). In the fourth century there is also Timocles (*FGrH* 86 T1). Cf. Taplin (1986) 163 and n1, who observes that actors, too, seem to have specialized in one genre or the other.

¹⁸ Pl. *Symp.* 223d: Socrates claims, "forcing the argument", that the same person ought to be able to write both. The comment of Bury (1932) *ad loc.* is on the right lines: "The point of Socrates' argument is that the *scientific* poet must be master of the art of poetry in its universal, generic aspect, and therefore of both its included species, tragedy and comedy". That also underlies the argument at *Ion* 531–3 that if Ion can talk about Homer, he ought to be able to talk equally well about all other poets, "for the whole thing [that is, all types of verse] is poetry, I suppose" (ποιητική γὰρ πού ἐστιν τὸ ὅλον, 532c8–9). For Plato's Socrates, if poetry were the way it ought to be and poets had proper knowledge of their business, there is no reason why a poet should not combine all genres (*Ion*), and the combination of tragedy and comedy should not be any more

There are broader issues, too, about 'genre'. That concept is not meaningless but it is problematic, and particularly so for someone writing at the time of Ion. 'Generic expectations' were never totally fixed in antiquity, especially in prose: we do better to think of 'on-the-whole' expectations, so that a reader picking up a work of, say, history or biography or even epic will have a provisional idea of what may be expected, but will not be surprised to find one or several of the usual features to be absent, or present in an unusual or off-key way.¹⁹ Many classical texts will have worked by revising readers' expectations as they go, continually constructing their own 'genre'. Of course, those provisional expectations have to come from somewhere, and any work is in dialogue with previous writings. Even before the fifth century, writers had to make choices, and decide that some themes were appropriate to iambi, say, and some to elegies, and—already in the sixth century²⁰—some to prose. Ion had to make those choices too. To decide that *The Foundation of Chios* should be in prose—assuming it *was* in prose—was to make a statement that his treatment aligned it with one range of material rather than another, an investigative, fact-based cousin to Hecataeus or Hippias or Xanthus of Lydia, rather than to Hesiod or Xenophanes or Panyassis.²¹ That feeling of what is 'appropriate' to one sort of writing or another can be traced in Herodotus and Thucydides

out of the way than any other (*Symph.*). Despite the idiosyncrasy of Plato's thought, as so often he is building paradoxes on assumptions that others would share.

¹⁹ 'Genre' has been the subject of much interesting recent discussion: see, for instance, Dubrow (1982), Dougherty (1994), Fowler (1991), Barchiesi (2001) and Depew and Obbink (2000); on the particular issues raised by history and biography: Geiger (1985), especially pp. 12–3, Marincola (1999), Burridge (2004). I had my own say in Pelling (1999), and add a little more in Pelling (2006b).

²⁰ Goldhill (2002b) 4, 10. But Goldhill brings out that it was the fifth century that saw the emergence of prose "as a trendy, provocative, modern and highly intellectualized form of writing" (p. 1); "[p]rose is the medium in which the intellectual revolution of the enlightenment is enacted" (p. 4); "the new prose brings to bear scientific enquiry and theorizing about politics and the real world" (p. 8).

²¹ Cf. Jacoby's similar remark on Hecataeus' choice of prose: (1909) 83 = (1956) 20. On poetic forerunners of (especially local) historiography cf. Bowie (1986) 27–34, discussing Ion at p. 32 and n104, and especially (2001a); Fowler (1996) 65 and (2001) 96; Dougherty (1994). A choice of prose remains significant even if Dougherty is right (as she probably is) to deny that *ktisis* poetry was "an authentic archaic genre", interpreting "genre" in terms of performance context: *some* mode of poetic performance (even if fictive?) would still be the more familiar way of addressing such a theme, and the choice of prose would not be casual. That point holds no matter how different or how similar *later* prose and poetic local historians became: on this difficult issue see Clarke (2005).

too,²² and if a similar sensitivity were not there in the theatre, comedy would never be able to make jokes out of paratragedy. But that does not mean that 'genre' is working in the same way as it does later, especially in prose. In later authors, genre tends to be most interesting and suggestive when it is problematic, when a work starts pressing on the boundaries of what may be comfortable within those "provisional expectations"; but in the *Epidemiai*, it is not clear that there were many provisional expectations at all, any real boundaries on which to press. In that case, more stress needs to fall on the expectations Ion created as he went—if only we could reconstruct what these were.

Biography and history provide particularly treacherous generic ground, and once again we need to guard against distortion through retrospect. We are so used, in modern times as in ancient, to later biography defining itself in relation to history. Plutarch and Nepos in famous passages define their biographies *against* history: "it is not history I am writing", says Plutarch, "but *Lives*..." (*Alex.* 1.2); Nepos is afraid that "if I were to start setting out what happened, I might seem not to be telling the story of his life but to be writing history" (*Pelop.* 1.1). Their modern successors, too, exploit a similar distinction, Bacon and Carlyle and Emerson and Strachey and many more.²³ The contrast can be used to put biography down as much as to build it up. "Biography offers the easy approach to history, and some go no further than

²² Cf. Hdt. 2.116.1, where Homer is assumed to have rejected the Egyptian version of Helen as "not as proper for epic composition as the one he adopted": οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιίην εὐπρεπὴς ἦν τῷ ἐτέρῳ τῷ περ ἐχρήσατο. The wording suggests more than choosing a version to suit his plot: this is a question of 'propriety' for 'epic'. On Thuc. 1.21, see below.

²³ Bacon (1605) 179–80 arguing that lives "must of necessity contain a more true, native, and lively representation" than chronicles or other sorts of narration; Carlyle (1840) 382: "History is the essence of innumerable biographies"; Strachey (1918) preface: "The history of the Victorian Age will never be written...I have attempted through the medium of biography, to present some Victorian visions to the modern eye...I hope, however, that the following pages may prove to be of interest from the strictly biographical no less than from the historical point of view". But we should also note that Carlyle claimed that "the History of the World...was the Biography of Great Men" (1846: 21), and wrote the "History" of Frederick the Great; that the sub-title of Strachey's *Elizabeth and Essex* is "a Tragic History"; and that Bacon counts biography as a way of presenting a "just and perfect history". Emerson's "There is properly no history, only biography", is not too far away (1841: 153). The distinction of two genres allows and perhaps demands, for Bacon, Carlyle, Emerson and Strachey as (surely) for Plutarch, the claim that biography allows insights into history, the subject-matter, that history, the literary genre, cannot match.

biography”, says Syme:²⁴ for him Tacitus’ development from *Agricola* to *Annals* and *Histories* is a sign of intellectual growth, a readiness to grapple with a theme that required “substance, insight, and intensity”.²⁵ It is hard not to read back a similar contrast of history and biography into Ion as well. If he was writing about famous men, this puts him in the genealogy of biography—and so we find assumptions that the *Epidemiai* must have looked like our biographies too.

Take for instance the famous story of Sophocles stealing a kiss from a pretty boy (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). It looks—Jacoby argued²⁶—as if this was the first time Ion mentioned him in the work, for the fragment concludes with a summary of ‘what Sophocles was like’ (witty rather than practical) that would be odd if he were already a familiar character; and—still according to Jacoby—the time Ion met him at Chios is therefore likely to have been the first time the pair came to know each other well. Yet that is predicated on too many assumptions on how a biographical work ought to look. We have no right to assume that Ion’s work was ordered chronologically at all,²⁷ so that even if this *was* the first mention of Sophocles, it need not correspond to the chronological first meeting: here the structure of Xenophon’s *Apomnemonemata* might have provided a helpful warning, or indeed the complex chronological interweavings of Herodotus. Nor, anyway, is it unthinkable that such a summary may have come at something other than Sophocles’ first mention. Its point—that the poet’s speciality was sympotic wit rather than state activity—is introduced to explain Sophocles’ pleasantry (“Pericles said I could write poetry but did not know how to be a general...”), and is not just a generalizing aside.

That history-biography divide can also make Ion’s choice to write these *Epidemiai* seem odder than it is. For Momigliano, the conditions of the time told for historiography, not of biography. “[A]t least for Athens”, he says, “we can say that the cultural background as a whole did not favour the prominence of biography or autobiography”: the important decisions are taken by states rather than individuals, official ideology encouraged the suppression of individual names when a

²⁴ Syme (1958) 91.

²⁵ Syme (1958) 131.

²⁶ Jacoby (1947a) 3 and n3 = (1956) 147–8 and n19.

²⁷ As Jacoby concedes in *FGrH* 392 Notes, p. 193, stating first that the arrangement was “*ganz unsystematisch*” and then, sensibly, that we have insufficient evidence to know.

funeral orator celebrated the city, and the great achievements were those of Athens and Sparta rather than Themistocles and Leonidas.²⁸ Let us leave aside the question whether 'biography' is the right word for what Ion wrote. That issue can hardly even be discussed without imposing an anachronistic generic straitjacket, but perhaps we can follow a hint of Simon Swain and Mark Edwards and talk of "the biographic" rather than "biography", concentrating more generally on Ion's interest in the way great figures lived, not on any question of literary form.²⁹ Can Momigliano really be right? In a political world where Athens, democracy as it was, was still dominated by big men, Themistocles, Cimon, Ephialtes, Thucydides son of Melesias, Pericles, and by the end of Ion's life,³⁰ Cleon? Where, in the islands, one alternative to Athens was Persia, the land of the charismatic Great King, and the other might be Sparta, a city which, for all its militaristic culture, was unusually ready to celebrate great men,³¹ and where Pausanias and then Pleistoanax were providing absorbing scandals? In a literary world where lyric and elegiac poets had certainly developed an 'I'-voice as they paraded likes and dislikes, including political likes and dislikes, and where—even if that 'I' was sometimes hard to pin down, an 'I' of performer or character or audience as well as of poet—a Solon or a Sappho in their different ways could still invite readers to construct strong views of a poet's own actions, emotions, and experience? And where *'the poet' par excellence* was still Homer, with his tales of great men, where the *Odyssey* had controlled its presentation around one great man in particular, and had given four of its most memorable books to be delivered by the man himself as his travel-account?³² Where, as Graziosi has shown, thinking about the literary interpretation and influence of

²⁸ Momigliano (1993) 38–40 (quotation from p. 38).

²⁹ Swain (1997), especially pp. 1–2; Edwards (1997), especially pp. 227–8, 233–4.

³⁰ Not that we can be sure when Ion died: before 422, as Ar. *Peace* 835–7 shows, but that passage and its scholion (T8 Leurini = *FGH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835) do not make it certain that his death was recent. Ion is there, not necessarily because he is only just dead, but for the pun on *Aioios*: he and his poem also allow Aristophanes a neat transition from dithyramb-poets (828–31) to other shooting stars, the ones the wealthy carry in their lanterns (839–41). This last point tells against the suggestion of Jacoby (1947a) 1n3 = (1956) 144n3 that the verses were a last-minute addition to *Peace*.

³¹ As Bruno Currie points out to me. Thus it is to Sparta that Themistocles goes to get his crown and other honours (Hdt. 8.124.2–3); and notice the (somehow formalized?) 'praise' of Brasidas at Sparta in 431 BC (Thuc. 2.25.2) and of the *theios aner* (Pl. *Meno* 99d, Arist. *NE* 1145a27).

³² Strasburger (1972) 21–2 = (1990) 1074; (1986) 6 = (1990) 346.

Homer most naturally took the form of questions concerning Homer's own life and that of his successors.³³ Of course there are those collective strands *as well*; they were there as early as Homer, with his interest in exploring how similar Greeks are to Trojans—whole peoples, not only Hector and Achilles. But, if we think of Homer, we may think also of the centrality of hospitality to the *Odyssey*, and its theme of encounters in one land after another: so again Ion's choice of *Epidemiai* is not so surprising after all, even if that lack of a single central character still marks an important difference.

So, just as the biographic in Homer's case was the most natural register for exploring questions of literary history, so it could easily be *one* possible register for thinking about politics and political history. Indeed, it is very odd that Momigliano should claim that "[t]he idea that one could treat the Persian or the Peloponnesian Wars in biographical terms never dawned upon the mind of any Greek historian of the fifth century".³⁴ Yet Pausanias ran into great trouble for a dedication that represents the achievement as his rather than the Spartans' (so it certainly "dawned upon" *his* mind to see things in biographical terms: Thuc. 1.132.2–3); Herodotus talks of Leonidas' glory (*kleos*) in terms that invited comparison with Homer;³⁵ the Spartan Brasidas was heroized after his death, and—perhaps—the Athenian Hagnon before him even during his life;³⁶ some contemporaries could think of the Peloponnesian War as 'Pericles' war';³⁷ the magnitude of Themistocles' contribution to the success in 480, and the uncomfortable position in Athens that his greatness brought, was clearly an *issue*. Whether or not Greek historians

³³ Graziosi (2002).

³⁴ Momigliano (1993) 40.

³⁵ That comparison is anything but straightforward: I explore this in Pelling (2006a). But Momigliano over-simplifies: "The Spartans and the Athenians, not Leonidas and Themistocles, are Herodotus' protagonists of the Persian Wars. There is no indispensable Achilles or Hector in them—which shows the limits of Herodotus' debt to Homer" (p. 40). There are indeed differences from Homer's world, but the issue is not one that Herodotus and his audience wave away: Leonidas as a Homeric figure is a thought-provoking possibility, not a non-starter.

³⁶ Thuc. 5.11.1 with Malkin (1987) 228–32 and Hornblower (1996) 449–55.

³⁷ That is a reasonable inference from the attacks on his friends at the beginning of the war, from Ephorus *FGH* 70 F196 (Diod. 12.38–41.1), and from the parodic twist given in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*: Pelling (2000) 151–5. It is reasonable, too, to see Thucydides constructing his first book in a way that rebuts such an interpretation: Pelling (2000) 91–2.

eventually told the tales in a biographic way, it is unthinkable that it never “dawned upon” them to do so.

Indeed, it clearly did. Ion shows that, and he was not the only one to favour the biographic: Stesimbrotus of Thasos (*FGrH* 107) wrote “on Themistocles and Thucydides and Pericles”. Doubtless Ion and Stesimbrotus may not belong so closely together as they are sometimes put in modern treatments.³⁸ If there is little of the ‘I’-voice in Ion, there is even less in Stesimbrotus—little hint that the writer’s own experiences or meetings were particularly stressed, for instance.³⁹ Stesimbrotus also may well have concentrated on “education” (*FGrH* 107 F1 on Themistocles, F4 on Cimon), something that probably⁴⁰ makes it reasonable to see him as pioneering that interest in *paideia* which we often see in later ‘biographies’, from Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* onwards.⁴¹ We can be fairly sure that Ion did not develop a similar interest. If he had, Plutarch, who liked material on childhood,⁴² would surely have drawn upon him; and meeting the famous during ‘spells of residence’ is one thing, meeting children who are later to be famous and noting their education is rather more difficult. But even though Stesimbrotus and Ion were probably not literary twins, an interest in “the biographic” is a thing they share.

Perhaps, indeed, Ion and Stesimbrotus should encourage us to approach historiography in a way that would itself, to moderns, seem back-to-front. Instead of defining biography against history, we should see “the biographic” as a strand—along with local history,⁴³ fable,⁴⁴ epic⁴⁵ and others—that fifth century historiography not merely draws on, but

³⁸ For example, by Pelling in *OCD*³ s.v. biography, Greek; Momigliano (1993) 32 and 42 (though p. 30 discriminates the two writings); Strasburger (1986) = (1990).

³⁹ Only really *FGrH* 107 T2, F10a = Ath. 589de, where Athenaeus says that he was not merely a contemporary of Pericles but also “saw him” (ἐωρακὼς αὐτόν): had Stesimbrotus recalled this ‘seeing’ as the sort of social sympotic encounter we see in Ion, Athenaeus would have said so (it would have suited his interests). Jacoby (*FGrH* 107 Notes, p. 343) rightly distinguishes the two: “das waren keine memoiren, wie Ions *Ἐπιδημία*—denn *St[esimbrotus]* hat *Themistokles* sicher nicht mehr gesehen”.

⁴⁰ Though here, too, there is a danger of misleading retrospect: two fragments do not make an overwhelming case, and they were selected by Plutarch for quotation because of his own interest in *paideia*.

⁴¹ So Schachermeyr (1965); cf. Pelling (1990a) 215, 217–8 = (2002) 302–4.

⁴² Pelling (1990a).

⁴³ See Fowler (1996), especially pp. 62–9, surely right here against Jacoby (1909).

⁴⁴ Griffin (1990).

⁴⁵ Cf., for example, Huber (1965); Strasburger (1972); Hornblower (1994b) 63–9; Boedeker (2002); Pelling (2006a).

also defines itself against.⁴⁶ We can see both Herodotus and Thucydides as plotting events in ways that play the influence of individuals against that of collectives. To explain the success in 480–79, Herodotus’ text pays credit both to the individual flair of Themistocles and to the emotive force of Greek freedom (and Themistocles’ characteristics mirror as well as exploit the strengths both of Athens and of the Greeks as a whole⁴⁷); Thucydides needs both the individual strengths and weaknesses of Pericles or Alcibiades and the national characteristics of Athens and Sparta to explain why events of the Peloponnesian War went the way they did (and again those individuals both interact with, and in part reflect, characteristics of their city). It was not just to the East, as Homeyer and Momigliano thought,⁴⁸ that Herodotus looked to find a stress on the individual in history. If more of Herodotus’ focus rests on Persian and Lydian individuals than Greek, that is a matter of his own interpretation rather than his source-material, bringing out how the personalities of Persian dynasts drove events more straightforwardly than the great men of Greece; just as Thucydides’ increasing stress on individuals in the later books marks, not a change of his own mind-set over the years, but an awareness that the characteristics of an Alcibiades or a Nicias were beginning to affect events *in a different way* from anything that had happened earlier—that, say, personal weaknesses and frailties were becoming relevant in a way that they had not with Pericles.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ This approach is closer to that of Marincola (1999), especially p. 292: “Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides were not just reacting *to* writers in other genres, they were in dialogue *with* them as well”; and Lendle (1992) 32: Ion’s concentration on leading personalities ‘strikes a chord’ that is perpetually heard in later historiography. Contrast the pronouncement of Jacoby (1909) 113 = (1956) 52: “*Es gab, als er [Herodot] sein Material sammelte, prosaische Genealogien, Periodoi und Ethnographien; es gab keine literarischen Localchroniken, so wenig wie es Hellenika oder Biographien gab*”. It depends what one means by “biographies” (and indeed by *Localchroniken*), but Jacoby’s dictum risks obscuring an important perspective. The view presented here does not imply any particular ‘publication’ date for the *Epidemiai*: Jacoby *FGrH* 392 Notes, p. 194 put this in the first five years of the Peloponnesian War, which would be before, but not much before, the date usually (and controversially) given for Herodotus’ ‘publication’. But ‘publication’ is a much more continuous process in the ancient world than the modern, and both Ion and Herodotus could be reacting to one another’s oral presentations as much as to any written version.

⁴⁷ Blösel (2001), an interesting and cogent thesis even if (as I think) overstated in detail.

⁴⁸ Homeyer (1962), especially pp. 82–3, followed by Momigliano (1993), especially pp. 21, 34–5; cf. Murray (1987) 108, 112 = (2001) 32–3, 40.

⁴⁹ So Gribble (1999).

When Thucydides maps out his own terrain, he does define history, at least his sort of history, against other modes of doing things (1.21.1):

Still, if we base ourselves on the indications I have mentioned, anyone who thinks that events happened in something like the way I have explained would not go far wrong. It would be a mistake to put more trust in the way the poets have sung their praises, exaggerating and embroidering everything, or in the way the logographers have put things together, paying more attention to attractiveness to the ear than to truth, given that the subject-matter is beyond verification and in most cases, because of the passing of time, has fought its way through to a mythical style in an untrustworthy way; no, one should rather think that my account has been based on the clearest indications, and that the truth has been found adequately given the antiquity of the material.

That is an important text for early conceptions of 'genre'.⁵⁰ Thucydides knows that different types of writing have different characteristics, ones that he parades his determination not to share.

That takes us some way towards 'genre'—but what Thucydides does not suggest is that there is a pre-existing genre of history into which his work will neatly slot. Indeed, he need not imply that there is a single genre into which it does *not* slot either. "Logographers" is a conveniently capacious term, probably meaning no more than "prose-writers", and it suits Thucydides' rhetoric here to be broad-brush and use the excesses of some "prose-writers" to be dismissive about them all.⁵¹ They doubtless include Herodotus, taken as the prize example of prose-writers just as Homer was earlier prime among poets, the figures most worth defining himself against;⁵² but they will not be his only targets, only the pre-eminent ones.

⁵⁰ Hornblower (1991) 58: "This distinction between literary genres is new and remarkable".

⁵¹ Thus Pearson (1939) 7, followed by Hornblower (1994b) 59, defines "logographers" as "those who write about the past in prose". We probably need not even limit it to "the past" rather than contemporary events: any relevant prose predecessor ought to count, just as any relevant poetic predecessor is included in 'the poets'. LSJ is right to give simply "prose-writer" (as at Arist. *Rhet.* 1388b22, who refers to speeches of praise and encomia "either by poets or by λογογράφοι"). So Gomme (1945) 1.138 *ad loc.*: "prose-writers in general, as opposed to the poets, and therefore in this connexion, the historians of an earlier generation or contemporary with Thucydides"; Walbank (1967) 39 on Plb. 7.7.1. In a different frame of mind, Thucydides might have included Ion and Stesimbrotus, though 1.97.2 suggests that he did not (see note 53).

⁵² Thus 'the poets' and their exaggeration link back to his earlier treatment of Homer (1.9.4 and especially 10.3, where "it is reasonable to expect him to have exaggerated and embroidered, poet as he was": the phrase there for "exaggerated and embroidered", ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον... κοσμήσαι, is echoed by ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον κοσμοῦντες here), and the scathing

As it happens, Ion is probably not included among these targets in 1.21 (and probably not Stesimbrotus either, even though he had written about Themistocles and 480):⁵³ the *Epidemiai* did not deal with the earlier history that Thucydides has so far been mainly concerned with. But if my argument here is right, Ion and others such as Stesimbrotus may lurk in the background too, and in the background for both Herodotus and Thucydides. As Thucydides goes on in his narrative, he like Herodotus can mark out his different approach to personality by the way he does things, not in a programmatic preface. If both he and Herodotus are in dialogue with more personal and ‘biographic’ ways of describing events, Ion was not the only key player on the other, earlier side of that dialogue, but he was surely one.

“Ion of Chios”

So far we have been struggling against the back-to-front approach to Ion, endeavouring to break away from retrospect and to see him in his own context. There is another way, which is not to reject the later perspectives on Ion but to refine them. Plutarch, the author to whom we owe most of our knowledge of the *Epidemiai*, was no fool, and he pretty certainly knew Ion’s text well. He was also, pretty certainly, writing for an audience who did not know Ion at all well, probably an audience for whom Ion was little more than a name. If he was to mention Ion

remarks on the logographers seem equally to look back to “the indifference to truth” which he identified at 20.3 as typical of careless Greek ideas. The examples he had quoted of such carelessness had been the clearest pointers to Herodotus, the kings’ double vote and the “Pitanate *lochos*”. Cf. Woodman (1988) 8–9, who is good on the links with the preceding narrative; but it is reasonable to think, *pace* Woodman, that Thucydides is defining his own writing project against preceding versions as well as the scale of his war against earlier conflicts. So, rightly, Nicolai (2001) 265 and n2.

⁵³ Ion’s subject-matter, too, has a very slight overlap with that of the Archaeology, given that 1.18.2–19 glance at the Pentekontaetia, in particular the Athenians’ treatment of their allies. But 1.97.2 suggests that Thucydides did not regard Ion or Stesimbrotus as giving a serious narrative of those events: there, Thucydides seems to claim that the mid-war period has been neglected (ἐκλιπέε) by everyone; the one person he names as treating it, Hellanicus, had done so badly. That should however not be taken as implying that he did not know their work, or expected his readers not to know it. The topics he claims were neglected were those concerning “war and management of affairs”, the actions of the Athenians “against their own allies when they revolted and the Peloponnesians whom they came across” (much the same themes as 18.2–19): for the austere Thucydides, the ‘biographic’ subject-matter of Ion and Stesimbrotus would have seemed something different.

at all and to get the name to add anything to his own narrative, he had to construct an 'Ion', not merely quote him (the same goes for 'Stesimbrotus'). How he did this, and what he got out of this constructed 'Ion' for his own themes, is a good question in its own right, whether or not his 'Ion' leads us any closer to the real one.

Why does Plutarch quote at all? Some *Lives*, and some parts of *Lives*, are profuse with quotations, others just give us the information without citation and leave the reader to take it on Plutarch's own authority. *Cimon* and *Pericles* are the *Lives* that cite Ion and Stesimbrotus most, and even in those we can identify material that may well come from Ion or Stesimbrotus, at least in part—but Plutarch does not bother to say so, and it would be rash to claim any individual instance as a 'fragment'.⁵⁴ Sometimes, doubtless, a patina of quotations has much to do with building that 'authority'. Once some sections have demonstrated a researcher who knows the sources well, a reader is more likely to take the rest of the narrative on trust—though it is still a good question why Plutarch chooses the items he does, rather than any others, for such citation-marking. Sometimes it is more a question of a clash of sources or a narratorial 'distancing' from an allegation, something to reduce a reader's certainty about the material rather than to reinforce it: that can be done in the subtlest of ways, for instance in *Theseus*.⁵⁵ Or sometimes the point is not so much that a citation makes something more or less likely to be *true*, but simply that something was *said*: that Pericles, or Cimon, or Alcibiades, or Antony was the object of hostile talk and rumour-mongering. We should also not be surprised to find citations artfully placed, contributing to the structure of a *Life* in one way or another. In *Cimon*, for instance, important citations of Stesimbrotus mirror one another at the beginning and end of the *Life*.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Jacoby thought that Stesimbrotus was "*durchaus nebenquelle für einzelheiten*" for Plutarch (*FGH* 107 Notes, p. 344): in his notes and in Jacoby (1947a) he raises the possibility of a Stesimbrotus origin for *Them.* 2.8 on Themistocles' youth, *Per.* 8.5 on the conversation between King Archidamus of Sparta and Thucydides son of Melesias, 10.5 on Elpinice's intervention with Pericles to press for an end to Cimon's ostracism, 29 on Cimon's son Lacedaemonius (so also Meister 1978: 287–8, and Strasburger 1986: 10–11 = 1990: 350–1; *contra*, Pelling 2000: 107), and of an Ion origin for the Lachartus incident at *Cim.* 17.2. Strasburger (1986) 10 = (1990) 350 thinks *Per.* 12 and 14 almost certainly from Stesimbrotus. Stadter (1989) lxii suggests Ion as the source for the conversation of Archidamus and Thucydides in *Per.* 8 and the story of Anaxagoras at *Per.* 16.7–9. Cf. also notes 58 and 95 below.

⁵⁵ Pelling (2002) chapter 7.

⁵⁶ 4.5 (*FGH* 107 F5): see above; and 16.3 (*FGH* 107 F7): see note 65 below.

The longest and most important quotation from *Ion* comes right in the centre of the *Cimon*, and that is unlikely to be coincidence either: most modern discussions place the incident later than the point the narrative has then reached (that is, after the battle of the Eurymedon rather than before), and if so, it is presumably Plutarch himself who has displaced it.⁵⁷ He has just described Cimon's victorious return from Scyros with Theseus' bones, and told how "after he had made the usual libations" with his fellow-generals, the theatre audience forced them by acclamation to "judge" (κρίνειν) the dramatic contest.⁵⁸ Both the libations and the judging form verbal links with the *Ion*-story that follows.

Ion says that he dined with Cimon when he was a very young man, after he had come to Athens from Chios; it happened at the house of Lao-medon. After the libations, Cimon was invited to sing, and he did so very pleasantly. The guests praised him as being cleverer than Themistocles, given that Themistocles had said that he had never learned to sing and play the lyre but knew how to make a city great and wealthy. That, in the way that parties have, brought the conversation round to Cimon's achievements, and the greatest of these were being mentioned. Cimon himself (the story continues) recounted one of his own stratagems as the cleverest thing of all. It had been after the fighting at Sestos and Byzantium, when the allies had taken many barbarian prisoners and gave Cimon the task of distributing them. He had separated out the prisoners from the clothes and jewellery they had been wearing, and the allies complained that the distribution was unfair. Cimon had responded by inviting them to pick whichever of the two they wanted: the Athenians would be content to take the other. Herophytus of Samos had spoken in favour of taking the Persians' possessions rather than the Persians themselves, and so that was what the allies did, leaving the prisoners themselves for the Athenians.

⁵⁷ Not that the date either of Eurymedon or of the party is clear. Badian (1993) 2–12, 100 puts the battle in late summer 466 and Hornblower (1991) 153 in "[p]erhaps 467", but dates several years earlier or later have their supporters. The dinner-party is put after Eurymedon by Jacoby (1947a) 2 = (1956) 145–6; von Fritz (1967) 101 and Anm. 73n73; von Blumenthal (1939) 1, 10, who puts it in 462; West (1985) 72, who puts it in 466–5 (which may or may not be after Eurymedon); Strasburger (1986) 2 = (1990) 342 in 467–5. Whatever its date, the anecdote, and the second capture of Sestos after that of 479–8 which it implies, are accepted as historical by Badian (1993) 86 and 211n43.

⁵⁸ It is very likely that the theatre-judging anecdote comes from *Ion* too, especially given the emphasis on Aeschylus and Sophocles at the end: we can tell that both poets interested him (104 Leurini = *FGtH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d; 101 Leurini = *FGtH* 392 F7 = Schol. M Aesch. *Pers.* 432). If so, it is one of those interesting cases where we can ask why one anecdote gets the citation rather than the other. Perhaps he can do more with *Ion* in a story about 'allies' than about 'playwrights', at least in this *Life*.

For the moment, Cimon went off looking to be a ridiculous distributor, for the allies were carrying away gold bracelets and necklaces and collars and jackets and purple robes, while the Athenians were left with naked bodies, under-exercised and unfit for work. But a little later the friends and relatives of the prisoners arrived from Phrygia and Lydia, and they gave vast sums of money to ransom each. It had amounted to a sum that allowed Cimon to maintain the fleet for four months, and also for the city to get a surplus of considerable gold from the ransom-payments.

(106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = *Plut. Cim.* 9.1–6)

Notice first how Ion is introduced: just “Ion”, though the point that “he had just arrived from Chios” makes it clear which Ion is meant. (Not “Ion the poet” as at 5.3 [109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15] and elsewhere: in some of those other cases that “poet” is significant, as we shall see.) The sympotic setting matters too. Plutarch’s readers may have known that a fair number of Ion’s stories centred on symposia-scenes, and he was the sort of author that one went to for stories like this; but the symposium matters for Cimon as well as for Ion. Cimon behaves with charm and grace as well as accomplishment. Yet at the beginning of the *Life*, another passage marked by a citation had presented Cimon very differently:

Stesimbrotus of Thasos, a close contemporary of Cimon, says that he was never taught *mousike* nor any other of the disciplines thought appropriate for a free man and for Greeks, that he was totally devoid of Attic sharpness and wit, and there was a heavy element of nobility and truth underlying his character and the style of his soul was more Peloponnesian,

“unpretentious, unclever, good at what matters most”,
like Euripides’ Heracles. For one might add that as a way of summarizing what Stesimbrotus said.

(*Cim.* 4.5 = *FGrH* 107 F4)

“Stesimbrotus of Thasos”, we notice, not just “Stesimbrotus”, as Plutarch usually styles him.⁵⁹ In *Cimon*, these island origins get mentioned.⁶⁰ That early chapter had left no doubt of Cimon’s early excesses, including drinking excesses, even if Stesimbrotus also saw him as a thoroughly good fellow at heart.⁶¹ Both in *mousike* and in drinking manners, Cimon

⁵⁹ *Them.* 2.3, 4.3, 24.5, *Cim.* 14.5, 16.1, 16.3, *Per.* 26.1, 8.9, 36.6 = *FGrH* 107 FF1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11. *Per.* 12.16 = *FGrH* 107 F16 is the only other “of Thasos”, in a context where hostility and envy is in point.

⁶⁰ Just as the “Chios” is important when “Ion of Chios” is quoted at *Thes.* 20.2 (96* Leurini = 29 West) for the item “about his own country”.

⁶¹ That favourable aspect was a problem for Jacoby, who thought that Stesimbrotus would clearly be hostile to Cimon as the conqueror of his home-town Thasos. He

has clearly improved. And that corresponds to a chiasmic pattern that underlies the whole pair (one indeed noted in the synkritic epilogue, 1.4): Cimon begins with a notorious and scandalous boyhood, and matures into a man of great achievement; Lucullus moves in the opposite direction, sinking after his days of glory into a decadent and slothful old age.⁶² The elaborate proem to the pair, telling how the erotic excesses of a Roman commander nearly brought Chaeronea to destruction until Lucullus stepped in and spared the town, has multiple suggestions for the pair as a whole, and its contribution to the synkrisis is marked by the similar story told of Pausanias at *Cim.* 6.4–7, where the allies' outrage at a similar abuse of power aligns them with Cimon himself. In those stories, the excesses come from others (the Roman commander; Pausanias); Lucullus and Cimon are those who step in to punish them or exploit the opportunities they offer. But the protagonists have their excesses too, and the pair explores the ways in which luxury can turn sour, unless the man of power shows tact and self-control.⁶³ Tact and self-control are, by now, Cimon's hallmarks...

...especially in the way he treats *the allies*. That is the theme of the story Cimon told in that symposium; and there is a quiet point too in the way that this "very young man" Ion, just arrived from Chios, is so civilly admitted to the company. In the story the allies are not merely treated with tact, it all also tells to the good of Athens. Notice here that the remark of Themistocles comes out a little differently from the version in *Themistocles* itself. Here Themistocles claims to know how to make a city "great and wealthy", but at *Them.* 2.4 "famous and great". That 'wealth' motif here ties in with the rest of the story, with its stress on the wealth that accrued to Athens. There continues to be

therefore suggested that not merely the Euripidean tag but also the "heavy element of truth" was an addition of Plutarch himself. That is certainly not the way Plutarch himself presents it: that passage, and the remark on the Peloponnesian soul, are still in indirect speech, marked as what Stesimbrotus "says". The Peloponnesian remark is also picked up in the mirroring citation of Stesimbrotus at the end of the *Life* at 16.3 (= *FGrH* 107 F7: see note 65). Stesimbrotus' appreciative treatment of Cimon may convey a point in Plutarch's narrative, the more so because it is unexpected in a Thasian: cf. note 77 below.

⁶² Pelling (1997a) 237–44 = (2002) 371–6.

⁶³ The role of these chapters in the thematic development of the pair is missed both by the commentators and in the para-commentary of Ma (1994), though Ma himself comments that "[t]he first great absence" [from his two different discussions of *Cim.* 1–2, both modelled on styles of contemporary scholarship] "is Plutarch himself" (p. 74). But it may be that "Plutarch himself" is not so absent from the recent style of Plutarch commentary as Ma implies.

an implied comparison with Themistocles throughout this anecdote. Themistocles was famed for his wiliness; Cimon's story intimates that he has a wiliness of his own. But the differences are greater than the similarities. Themistocles, after all, was not noted for discretion or tact with the allies,⁶⁴ and they would never have come to *him* and invited him to act as distributor. The end of the tale tells a story as well, in an understated way. The wealth accrued goes to—supporting the fleet, and to the city. Themistocles would not have been so selfless.

That corresponds to a wider theme of the *Life* and the pair. Just as *Lucullus* has a running internal comparison of Lucullus with Pompey, so *Cimon* repeatedly hints at a comparison with, in particular, Themistocles (sometimes Aristides and Pericles⁶⁵ too). Early on, Cimon "was a match for Miltiades in daring and for Themistocles in intelligence, and all agree that he was a juster man than either; he did not fall short of them in the slightest degree in the qualities of warfare, and in political affairs he outdid them to a remarkable degree, even as a young man without experience of warfare" (5.1). Very soon the *demos* has had enough of Themistocles and is favouring Cimon instead: he is "affable and welcome to the people because of his mildness [*praotes*, another key-word of the *Life*] and unpretentiousness"—again, very much an anti-Themistocles. Aristides, too, there supports him as a counterweight to Themistocles' cleverness (5.5–6). Themistocles goes on emerging at key-points of the *Life*,⁶⁶ until he kills himself at 18.7:

⁶⁴ That is an important emphasis in *Them.*, where the initial favourable impression of 7.4 has turned very sour by 21, introducing a series of hostile anecdotes with "he was loathsome to the allies too". *Them.-Cam.* was composed a little later than *Cim.-Luc.* (Jones 1966: 66–8 = 1995: 106–11), but Plutarch will already have known, and will have expected his readers to know, at least, the passage of Herodotus (8.111) which he there quotes. *Them.* shows a negative equivalent of the rhythm of *Cim.*: there it is Themistocles' unpopularity which starts in Athens, then seeps out to the allies and finally to the rest of "the Greeks".

⁶⁵ Pericles is not far away in the final citation of Stesimbrotus at 16.3 (= *FGrH* 107 F7), where "whenever Cimon was blaming or stirring up the Athenians, he would say 'but the Spartans are not like that'". The description of Pericles at Thuc. 2.65.9, who was more successful in conveying rebuke or encouragement in his speeches, is surely recalled here in that careful emphasis on "blaming or stirring up". But the contrary message that Pericles dinned into the Athenians, "not to yield to the Peloponnesians" (Thuc. 1.140.1), fell on more willing ears.

⁶⁶ 12.2, 13.3, and a Themistoclean theme is also echoed in the building of the North Wall at 13.5–6. The Spartan hostility to Themistocles is important at 16.2, where it is a reason they build up Cimon. Once again, he has a way with allies (at least people *he* wants to be allies) that Themistocles does not. The role of Themistocles at *Snk.* 3.4 is rather different, for there he softens up the Persians and Cimon finishes the job. That

by then he is planning to lead Persian forces against the Greeks, but despairs when he sees Cimon's run of glory and success. In this internal comparison there is no doubt who comes out the better, the champion of Greece rather than the traitor. The young Cimon may not have learnt the accomplishments "appropriate to a Greek" (Stesimbrotus at 4.5, quoted above), but it is distinctively "the Greeks" that he is leading to triumph at the end: this is a national, not just a civic, hero. That, too, is a link with Lucullus, where again the love of Greece and Greek culture is significant. Even in those final decadent scenes of Lucullus' life, his villa is "a headquarters of Greek culture",⁶⁷ a home from home to all philhellenes who arrived at Rome—and it was, once again, that respect which Lucullus showed for the Greek citizens of Chaeronea that is marked in the proem.

How, then, does this Athenian hero Cimon become a champion of Greece? Once again, the passage from Ion serves as a fulcrum. We have already noticed the verbal echoes of the preceding story: there, it was the Athenians who trusted him to be a judge, but in Ion's story it is the allies, and that catches an important rhythm of the whole *Life*. The same qualities endear Cimon first to the Athenians, then to the allies too: they trust him as "just"—the quality signalled at 5.1, quoted above—and the comparison with Aristides at 5.6 turns out to be the important one. Then the one group of allies whose enthusiasm is specifically mentioned are the Chians (12.4). Ion was not the only one of his countrymen to feel enthusiasm for the great man. They are all on the same side, and Themistocles was not.

Ion's last citation in the *Life* is again at an important moment. The Spartans have suffered their earthquake, and the helots are in revolt. Aristophanes is quoted for the Spartan appeal, when their ambassador Pericleidas sits "pale in his purple clothes at the altar, begging for an army" (*Lysistrata* 1138–41). Should Athens send aid?

Ephialtes said they should not, and called everyone to witness that they should not send help nor raise up a city to rival Athens; they should let

is one of several ways in which the epilogue redirects the emphasis of the narrative itself—an interesting issue but one that cannot be pursued here.

⁶⁷ *Luc.* 42.2 (πρυτανεῖον Ἑλληνικόν), echoing the way that Cimon opened his home as a *prytaneion* to the citizens of Athens at *Cim.* 10.7. There may be an allusion, too, to *Pl. Prot.* 337d6, where 'Hippias' talks of sophists flocking to Athens as "the *prytaneion* of wisdom of Greece"; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F281 said the same thing. Lucullus is turning Rome into Athens' successor.

the Spartan spirit lie and be trampled underfoot. According to Critias, Cimon then put an increase in his own country's power as a lower priority than the interests of the Spartans, and persuaded the *demos* to go out and help with a large company of hoplites. Ion recalls⁶⁸ the phrase with which he particularly moved the Athenians to action, urging them not to allow Greece to become lame, nor the city of Athens to have an ill-matched yokefellow.

(107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = *Cim.* 16.8–10)

Why so much quotation here? However reasonable the remarks of Ephialtes might have seemed in real fifth century life (for should not a gentleman help his friends but harm his enemies?), by this stage of the *Cimon* they suggest a lack of humane magnanimity: such a focus on Athens' own interests has come to seem parochial here, for by now the focus rests on a panhellenic crusade. That may be reinforced by the Aristophanes quotation too, where, as so often in Plutarch allusions, the whole context may be recalled. Lysistrata is there haranguing both Athenians and Spartans for their pettiness and ingratitude, and the mention of Cimon is an expressive one:⁶⁹ they should not fight one another, they should follow Cimon's line and join together against the barbarian enemy. What of Critias? He is obviously seen as right in emphasizing that Cimon played a crucial role—but is he also right in his view of Cimon's motives, that promotion of “the interests of Sparta”? Ion's contribution there should be seen as correcting as well as supplementing Critias: it is not just the interests of Sparta, it is all Greece which must not be “lame”.⁷⁰ And that final point—“nor the city of Athens to have an ill-matched yokefellow”, μήτε τὴν πόλιν ἑτερόζυγα περιδεῖν γεγενημένην—tells in the same direction. For ἑτερόζυγα does

⁶⁸ ἀπομνημονεύει, an expressive choice of word (cf. μνημονεύει at 103 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F4 = Ath. 93a): it is the appropriate word for ‘recalling’ in a personal memoir, especially recalling a memorable phrase, act or occasion (the conventional Latin translation *Memorabilia* for Xenophon's *Apomnemonemata* is not ideal, but not wholly astray). Ion's *Epidemiai* is once loosely cited as *Hypomnemata*, which carries a similar suggestion: T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835. Cf. von Blumenthal (1939) 2.

⁶⁹ Thus rightly Henderson (1987) 201, “Lys. urges the Spartans to return to the Kimonian policy...”

⁷⁰ Diod. 11.50.4 quotes an “ancient oracle” to the Spartans warning them that their own leadership should not be “lame”: in 475 BC this was interpreted (he says) as meaning the danger of losing one of their two leaderships (that is, those on land and on sea). de Ste Croix (1972) 170 thinks the story a plausible one, and that an oracle of this sort may be the origin of the “lame” figure. If it was that particular oracle, Cimon was particularly bold in interpreting the figure as applying to Athens.

not mean “without its yokefellow” (LSJ), as it is usually translated.⁷¹ It refers to a yoking of animals which are “ill-matched”,⁷² and the assumption is very much the same as in Greece being lame—that the two cities will still be doing a job together,⁷³ and they will do it best if both are operating from the same strength, both pulling their weight. Cimon wants a balance of power, but for co-operation rather than mutual fear. And this is an argument which, clearly, Cimon is felt to win. In Plutarch’s account, unlike the other versions of this episode,⁷⁴ Cimon’s intervention ends well, at least for the moment. The mission ends not with any humiliation, but with Cimon delivering an effective put-down of an uppity Corinthian (17.1–2).

This view of happy co-operation, of course, implies a readiness on the other side too to pull under the double yoke, and in this Cimon was to be disappointed when the Spartans sent him home: that famous

⁷¹ Thus such versions as “robbed of its yokefellow” (Perrin 1916), “deprived of its yoke-fellow” (Scott-Kilvert 1960; Flower 2000: 78), “deprive Athens of her yoke-fellow” (Rhodes 1992: 68), “Athens must not lose her yoke-fellow” (Meiggs 1972: 89), “not allow Athens to lose her yoke-fellow” (Bury 1952: 344; cf. Hammond 1967: 291), “ohne ihre Nebenroß fahre” (Ziegler), “nicht zuzulassen, daß...Athen seinen Gespannengenossen verliere” (von Fritz 1967: 101), “nicht ruhig mitanzusehen, wie...Athen einspännig geworden sei (das heißt den Jochpartner Sparta verloren habe” (Lendle 1992: 30) are all astray; even more so “ne pas permettre...que leur ville fût privée de sa rivale” (Chambray 1961, my emphasis). de Ste Croix (1972) 170n10 gets it right.

⁷² Admittedly the crucial parallels are late, but there is no reason to think that the word changed its meaning. Cf. Apollonius, *Lexicon Homericum* 93 l.1: κατ’ ἴσον ἔλκοντες, οὐχ ἑτεροζυγοῦντες; Sib. Or. 2.67 (= [Phocyl.] *Gnom.* 15) of literal balance—σταθμὸν μὴ κρούειν ἑτερόζυγον, ἀλλ’ ἴσον ἔλκειν. Most uses of the word in TLG are biblical, 2*EpCor.* 6.14: μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις (“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers”, in the King James version, taken by most patristic writers to be a reference to marriage); and *Leviticus* 19.19: τὰ κτήνη σου οὐ κατοχεύσεις ἑτεροζύγω (“thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind”). Only Hesychius s.v. οἱ μὴ συζυγοῦντες [ε 6558] seems to favour the usual interpretation; that may be evidence that the word was misunderstood in antiquity. The word is also a favourite of Nonnus, though he strangely uses it to mean “double-yoked” (LSJ).

⁷³ So Flower (2000) 78, bringing out the mistake of those who, like Fornara and Samons (1991) 126, have carelessly taken this ‘yoking’ to refer to an exercise of ‘dyarchy’ or hegemony over Greece. The Plutarch context makes it clear that the yoked pair are directed against Persia rather than fellow-Greeks.

⁷⁴ If (and the next note argues that it is a big ‘if’) Plutarch has turned one expedition into two, this will therefore not be because he “confuses several reports” (Jacoby on *FGH* 328 F117, Notes, p. 369), but because it is a deliberate expansion for thematic reasons: on this technique cf. Russell (1963) 23–5 = (1995) 361–7; Pelling (1980) 129–31 = (1995) 130–3 = (2002) 94–6.

rebuff comes, for Plutarch, on a separate second mission of aid (17.3).⁷⁵ This boorish response of the Spartans goes with the gathering factional hostility at Athens to hint at the tensions that remain, and the last chapter of the *Life* will stress how swiftly the panhellenic drive against Persia lost its impetus after Cimon's death. But the closing emphasis remains a highly positive one, underlining the success rather than its transience.⁷⁶ A vital element in that was the enthusiasm of the allies, and a vital element for Plutarch in bringing that out is the enthusiasm of Ion, the man from Chios. Nor—he further suggests—was Stesimbrotus unappreciative either, the man from Thasos, even if Cimon had conquered his own city.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ ἀνθις, *Cimon* 17.3. According to Plutarch, this second mission takes place after an interval, once the Messenians and helots had gathered at Ithome. It is hard to know whether Plutarch is right in claiming two missions: like Papantoniou (1951), Hammond (1955), Sealey (1957) 370 and Badian (1993) 89–92 (who finds a double expedition helpful in unravelling some of the chronological tangles of the sixties), I incline to think that he is. Thuc. 1.101–2 does not mention a double expedition (no surprise in that highly selective narrative), but 102.1 does make it clear that the expedition which led to the crucial rebuff took place some unspecified time after the earthquake and the outbreak of the helot war. Diod. 11.64.2 has only one expedition. Most modern treatments either argue for or assume a single expedition, for example, Jacoby on Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F117, de Ste Croix (1972) 173n19, Lewis (1992) 109 and 500, Meiggs (1972) 89 and n3, Cartledge (1979) 218 and 220, Hornblower (2002) 23, West (1985) 74, Henderson (1987) 201, Sommerstein (1990) 213; Gomme (1945) 1.301 and n1 allows Plutarch some credibility, but at 403–5 assumes a single expedition. Yet even in comedy, Lysistrata would find it difficult to talk of Cimon “saving all Sparta” (1144) with his four thousand hoplites if the response to Pericleidas’ appeal had simply been the humiliating rebuff; the Spartan speakers at Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.33 may anyway be tactless in recalling the Cimonian help, but are less tactless if a first expedition went well. It is true that Plutarch does sometimes expand material, though less frequently than he compresses, but it would equally be no surprise if Diodorus has streamlined his material by conflating two similar episodes.

⁷⁶ Pelling (1997a) 238 = (2002) 372.

⁷⁷ So, rightly, Schachermeyr (1965), especially pp. 16–9, and Meister (1978), especially pp. 277–81, against Jacoby and others. Stesimbrotus *FGrH* 107 F4 (= *Cim.* 4.5) stresses the underlying natural goodness as well as the lack of liberal education; *FGrH* 107 F5 (= *Cim.* 14.5) is more about Pericles than about Cimon, and in *FGrH* 107 F6 (= *Cim.* 16.1) the emphasis falls more on Pericles’ abuse than on Cimon himself; *FGrH* 107 F7 (= *Cim.* 16.3) may show Cimon failing to read the mood of the *demos*, but that can be their fault as much as his: a preference for Sparta over Athens is clear enough from *FGrH* 107 F4 = *Cim.* 4.5 itself. The evidence for hostility to Pericles is stronger (*FGrH* 107 FF 10–11): that may favour the view of an anti-Athenian stance (Meister), but in that case the more generous treatment of Cimon is even more striking.

"Ion the Poet"

Just as we can see Plutarch treating the same events in different ways when his themes required it,⁷⁸ so sometimes he constructs a different Ion too, "Ion the poet". One case of this is in the first chapter of *On the Fortune of the Romans*. Plutarch has introduced the question whether Virtue (*Arete*) or Fortune (*Tyche*) has contributed more to the success of Rome. Virtue, they say, strives fruitlessly, while Fortune's gifts are unreliable: yet if either could claim Rome for her own, how could Virtue be said to be fruitless or Fortune's gifts to be transient?

Indeed, Ion the poet in his unmetrical prose works comments that fortune is a thing most unlike wisdom, but it crafts the same results: for both make cities grow, give distinction to men, bring glory, power, and hegemony. (118* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F17a = *On the Fortune of the Romans* 316d)

Why that strange, pedantic "Ion the poet in his unmetrical prose works..."? That did not need saying, one would think: this is hardly a reference a reader would hunt up (or is given enough to hunt up). On the other occasion where Plutarch quotes the passage, it is simply from "Ion" (118* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F17b = *Table Talk* 717b).⁷⁹ But in a muted way it strikes a register that is very appropriate for the essay. Just as appreciating Rome requires a receptiveness to both Virtue and Fortune—for were not Rome's great men virtuous, and yet did it not need Fortune to find so many of the right people at the right times?—so it also involves some themes for which prose is appropriate and some that are more poetic. One needs to understand cosmic points about balance and providence, so that the rational construction of the world is balanced by the controlling role within it played by Rome: that is the theme of the next chapter (316d–7c), and it is unsurprising that that point should be illustrated from the prose writers Plato and Democritus. But Rome's history is inspirational too, and a few lines later Homer and Aeschylus are the appropriate citations to adorn the martial and civic virtues of men like Camillus and Fabricius and Fabius Maximus and the Scipios (317de). Nor is it just a matter of citations: Plutarch's

⁷⁸ Pelling (1980) on cases of this in the Roman *Lives*; (1992) 21–7 = (2002) 125–30 on some instances in his adaptation of Thucydides.

⁷⁹ Though even in this second quotation, the remark is said to have been made *μουσικῶς*, that is with the sense of art and grace that typifies a man of culture and—particularly, one might think—a poet: Ion's *métier* is not forgotten even there.

own style is often so lyrical as to verge on the poetic, as where Fortune's role in shepherding Caesar was to "ordain calm upon the sea, summer upon stormy winter, speed on the slowest, strength on the most spiritless..." (319d), or in the two exuberant pages elaborating the ship of state figure, itself picking up motifs from the Democritus passage (321cf ~ 317ab).⁸⁰ If "Ion the poet" made his point with striking language yet in a work of prose, Plutarch is doing much the same.

So there are times when "the poet" makes Ion exactly what Plutarch needs; but there is a time and a place for everything, and poetry is sometimes out of place. Take *Pericles*. Pericles was the sort of man people talked and wrote about, and what made him both troublesome and fascinating was that, just as with Alcibiades or Antony or Themistocles, those people said different things. It was troublesome in Pericles' own day: one of the features that linked him with Fabius was his "mildness" (*praotes*, *Per.* 2.5), a quality shown especially in dealing with verbal abuse (5.1–2) and with the sort of captious criticism that dogged his career—criticism of the building programme (12–3), of Aspasia (24, 30.4), of the war (31–2, etc.), and of much besides. Simply finding out the truth was hard enough, given that torrent of contemporary slander and bias (13.16): finding the right verdict was harder still. Prose writers who commanded the utmost respect said different things. For Plato (a subtle presence in much of the *Life*),⁸¹ Pericles was partly responsible

⁸⁰ That more 'poetic' mindcast also leads Plutarch to be less rationalistically critical than he is in the *Lives*: contrast especially the material on the foundation (320c–321b) with the treatment of the same items in *Romulus*, in a pair that is self-consciously "making the mythical look like history" (*Thes.* 1.5, cf. Pelling 2002, chapter 7). Thus the scepticism about the divine birth at *Rom.* 2.4, 3.4, 4.2–4 has no place at *Fort. Rom.* 320b, just as the supernatural darkness that covered the earth at 320bc has none in *Rom.* 2–3 (though it does at 27.7, where the *Life* has come to have a different tone: Pelling 2002, 186). *Fort. Rom.* 323b is then more willing to accept a story very similar to that rejected as implausible at *Rom.* 2.4–8. For further comparison of this essay with the *Lives*, cf. Swain (1989), especially pp. 509–14 and, on one case (320a ~ *Ant.* 33.2–4), Pelling (1988) 206–7.

⁸¹ Plato is often quoted (7.8, 8.2, 13.7, 15.2, 24.7), but Plutarch skirts around his direct criticism of Pericles in *Gorgias*: that passage surely lies behind 9.1 (so Stadter 1989: 111 *ad loc.*), where Thucydides' point is countered with a reference to the "many others" who blame Pericles for habituating the Athenian people to cleruchies and grants and doles (cf. especially *Gorg.* 515de, 518e–519a). Plutarch of course knew the closing sections of *Gorgias* well (he quotes them at *Arist.* 25.9, *Demetr.* 1.7, *Luc.* 45(2).6 and *God's Slowness to Punish* 561b), but it would not do to make a reference to the esteemed Plato too clear when Plutarch is dissenting from his view (Swain 1990). He *does* quote *Gorgias* 455e at 13.7 for the item that Socrates himself heard Pericles proposing the construction of the Long Wall, but one would not gather from that passage the critical tone of the later parts of *Gorgias*; nor do the allusion to and citations of *Phaedrus* 270–1 at

for the worst features of democracy; for Thucydides his rule was more a type of “aristocracy” (9.1, quoting and glossing Thuc. 2.65: cf. 15.3), and mediating between these two views demanded great finesse and technique.⁸² The comic poets said something else again. Pericles may have been Olympian (8.3–4), but his head was too big and pointed (3.4–7, 13.10), his sex-life was scandalous (13.15–6), and his power was as extraordinary (7.8, 16.2) as his spirit was cowardly (33.8); as for Aspasia, she could sometimes play Omphale or Hera and sometimes just be the madame of the brothel (24.9–10, 30.4).⁸³ And Stesimbrotus, so useful and productive a source for *Cimon*, was no exception in this *mélange* of unreliability and malice. Sometimes he was a hostile scandalmonger (13.16, 36.6), sometimes simply wrong (26.1).⁸⁴

Once again Stesimbrotus and Ion hunt together in Plutarch’s work, here linked in hostility as in *Cimon* they were in approval; and once again Ion is the more suggestive of the pair. Ion—and here it is “Ion the poet”—is first mentioned just after one of those displays of mildness, where Pericles had patiently put up with a man who had spent the whole day following him around town and pouring abuse on his head, and yet Pericles finally sent one of his servants to light the man’s way home (5.1–2).

Ion the poet, however, says that Pericles’ manner in company was in the style of someone who has got above himself (μοθωνικήν) and had a touch of arrogance (ὑπότυφον), and his haughty ways had mixed in with them a disdain and contempt for the common people; Ion praises instead Cimon’s attuned and relaxed and cultured manner of bearing himself in company. But let us leave Ion aside, given that he regards virtue as if it were a performance of tragedy which always requires a satyric element as well as the rest; as for those who dismissively called Pericles’ venerable behaviour (σεμνότητα) glory-hunting and arrogance (δοξοκοπίαν τε καὶ τῦφον), Zeno called on them to seek some sort of glory (δοξοκοπεῖν) like

5.1, 8.2, and 15.2 reflect the irony of the original (see Rowe 1986: 204–5 *ad loc.*). Cf. Stadter (1989) xlii–xliii.

⁸² On which see Stadter (1987), especially pp. 267–8, and (1989) xxxviii–xliii.

⁸³ On the wide range of material exploited in *Pericles* see especially Stadter (1989) lviii–lxxxv and Meinhardt (1957). Aspasia as Omphale: see Easterling on Ion’s *Omphale* in this volume.

⁸⁴ Not that Plutarch rejects Stesimbrotus completely: at 8.9 he is quoted for a memorable phrase from the Samian funeral speech, comparing the dead with the gods whom we cannot see, but whose existence we infer from the honours they receive and the goods they bestow. That phrase prepares for the deep feeling of the last chapter, where Pericles himself comes close to such divine stature.

that themselves, for the very pretence of goodness imperceptibly insinuates a certain desire and habituation in its ways.

(109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = *Per.* 5.3–4)

The words used are interesting. *μοθωνικὴν* is borrowed from the Spartan *μόθων*, presumably the same as *μόθαξ*, a child of (usually) lower status who was reared along with those of Spartan freeborn citizen stock.⁸⁵ To judge from Aristophanes, Athenians at least liked to think of such people as typically rather uppity, forgetting their station.⁸⁶ It is a most unusual word, and is probably Ion's own.⁸⁷ If so, and if the contrast with Cimon also figured in Ion's original passage (it probably did), the Spartanism cannot be coincidence, and the suggestion was presumably that Cimon followed the best Spartan ways whereas Pericles aped the worst. In a different mind-set—the mind-set of *Cimon* 4.5 or 16.9–10 (above), for instance, where Cimon's Laconism was in point, or even some later passages of *Pericles* itself (9.5, 10.1, 29.1–2)—Plutarch might have made something of this point himself: he certainly knew the Spartan suggestions of the word (*Agis and Cleomenes* 29(8).1).

But he does not. Here his point is a different one: this is “Ion the poet” indeed, applying—or so Plutarch affects—a poet's expectations of tragedy quite inappropriately. Once again the vocabulary makes the point, though in this case it is not clear whether the words are Plutarch's or Ion's own. Thus the language with which Cimon's style is described, “attuned” (*ἑμμελὲς*) and “relaxed” (lit. “moist”, *ὕγρον*) and “cultured” (lit. “Musified”, *μεμουσωμένον*), is already heading in that poetic direction, with the first and third of those terms drawn from the world of music and the Muses, and the second at home in describing literary style.⁸⁸ A page or so earlier, Plutarch had been telling us what the comic poets said, ungenerously, about Pericles and his teachers (4.1–6), and that chapter had moved on from comic playfulness to the more appropriate register for Pericles, the high seriousness of Zeno and Anaxagoras. This chapter now repeats the same rhythm, but this time it

⁸⁵ Cf. especially Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F43, with Lotze (1962) and Cartledge (1979) 314–5.

⁸⁶ Hence of “cheek” and “impudence” at *Knights* 635 and *Wealth* 279, and of a dance that showed similar cockiness at *Knights* 697. The scholia on the last two of those passages are illuminating.

⁸⁷ As Stadter (1989) 79 *ad loc.* suggests. See also Geddes in this volume.

⁸⁸ Cf. Ar. *Frogs* 1387 (where the “moistness” must be applicable to the word as well as to the river it describes); Pl. *Epigr.* 22.1 (= *AP* 6.43.1), 26.4 (= *AP* 9.823.4); Plut. *Table Talk* 614d; [Longinus] 34.2–3; Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 20.

is ‘tragic’ theatricality⁸⁹ and its concomitant satyr-play⁹⁰ that is rejected, and once again Zeno captures Pericles’ essence better. If Ion the poet is looking for *that* sort of style in Pericles, his expectations are off-key. And the point is still what people said about Pericles, both his critics and his supporters. Further word-play emphasizes the point: when his enemies “dismissively called” (ἀποκαλοῦντας) Pericles’ style glory-hunting, Zeno “called on them” encouragingly (παρεκάλει) to follow his model rather than deride it. That already presages that inspiring exemplary role for Pericles that Plutarch’s own work itself aspires to foster (*Per.* 1–2), and here it had been the most serious literary register—philosophy—that caught that best.

The deficiencies of such ‘tragic’ theatricality come back later in the *Life*, with the sensationalism of the Hellenistic historian Duris in treating the sufferings of his own people, the Samians, in 440 BC:

The Samians surrendered in the ninth month of the siege, and Pericles dismantled the walls, took over the ships, and imposed a heavy fine. The Samians paid a portion of this immediately and agreed to pay the rest on a fixed time-scale, giving hostages as security. As for the allegations that Duris adds in tragic style (ἐπιτραγωδεῖ), charging the Athenians and Pericles with great savagery, there is no mention of that in Thucydides or Ephorus or Aristotle. He does not even give the impression of telling the truth when he says that Pericles took the Samian captains and marines to the market at Miletus, bound them to planks and left them there for ten days so that they were in a terrible state, then finally ordered their execution by clubbing their heads and gave instructions for their bodies to be cast out without any rites. Even when Duris has no personal stake he is not accustomed to direct his narrative towards truthfulness, and in this case he seems to have intensified his countrymen’s suffering in order to denigrate the Athenians.

(*Per.* 28.1–3 = *FGrH* 76 F67)

⁸⁹ In Plutarch, tragic imagery often concentrates on what we might call the ‘theatrical’ or possibly the ‘dramatic’, suggesting showiness rather than any ‘tragic’ sensibility: cf. Pelling (1988) on *Ant.* 54.5. In other mind-sets, Plutarch’s hints of tragedy can be very different and much more constructive: cf. for example, Mossman (1988), Braund (1993), Zadorojniy (1997), Duff (1999) index s.v. tragic and tragedy, and Pelling (2002) index s.v. tragedy and tragic texturing, especially p. 111n27 (with further bibliography).

⁹⁰ The word ‘satyric’ comes back again at 13.16, this time of the life-style of the comic poets who presumed to spread such scandal about a far better man than themselves. Note that it is used of their own lives, not of their poetry (which was *not* satyric but comic): but just as the satyr-play bridges the gap between tragedy and comedy, so Plutarch uses the word to hint at the unsavoury expectations of the great that both tragic and comic poets share when they turn to real life.

Duris is affecting 'tragic style', and what tragedy does to truth is again clear: once again Plutarch borrows a term familiar from literary criticism, "intensifies" (δαινῶσαι),⁹¹ to make the point. And once again the sober tones of philosophy—Aristotle—or more respectable history—Thucydides, Ephorus—are the valuable corrective.

Here, too, Ion is not far away. The narrative goes on with, first, Pericles' funeral speech on the Athenians who died at Samos. The speech was acclaimed by "the other women", but not by Elpinice, Cimon's sister, who chided him for losing so many citizen lives, and doing so not in fighting foreign enemies as Cimon had done but in reducing a city of allies and kinsmen. Pericles replies with a smile and a gibe;⁹² then we hear more of Ion:

Ion adds that Pericles adopted an extraordinary and lofty attitude (θαυμαστόν...καὶ μέγα φρονῆσαι) after defeating the Samians, saying that Agamemnon had taken a barbarian city in ten years but he had defeated the first and most powerful of the Ionians in nine months. And the claim was a fair one: the war genuinely involved great uncertainty and risk, if, as Thucydides says, the city of the Samians all but managed to deprive Athens of her control of the sea.

(110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = *Per.* 28.7–8: the reference is to Thuc. 8.76.4 and the events of 411 BC)

⁹¹ Quintilian 6.2.24 defines it as the technique whereby "a speech adds forcefulness to things which are humiliating, harsh, or outrageous" (*rebus indignis asperis invidiosis addendis uim oratio*): cf., for example, [Longinus] 11.2 and 12.5, Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 19, and Stadter (1989) 260 on this passage of *Per.* and Pelling (1988) 154 on *Ant.* 14.7. The word is already used in that sense by Thuc. 8.74.3, of a messenger who arrives at Samos in 411 and exaggerates the political violence at Athens: Plutarch and his readers may have known that passage, and would have noted the reversal—as we shall see, he mentions that same sequence of Thucydides a few sentences later at 28.8.

⁹² That gibe is itself not without its interest, for Pericles quoted Archilochus' line "you would not perfume yourself with myrrh, old women as you are" (fr. 205 West). That can naturally be taken as an expression of scorn, as presumably in the original: Elpinice is so old that she can no longer rely on natural charms; and one can understand a preliminary protasis, "if you had sense" (West's apparatus cites Schneidewin's "*intellige εἰ μὴ φρενῶν ἀπεσφάλης*"), indicating that she ought not to involve herself in such things. So Stadter (1989) 262 *ad loc.* That develops the earlier Elpinice passage that is evidently recalled here: when she intervened for Cimon at 10.6, Pericles had told her "you are an old woman, an old woman (γρᾶυς εἶ, γρᾶυς εἶ), to be busying yourself with things like this". Yet there may be a further suggestion here that it is precisely the riches of empire that allow such adornment: but for people like me and wars like this, you would not have the myrrh. That, too, builds on an earlier passage, 12.2, where Pericles' critics attack him for using allied wealth to "gild and beautify the city as if it were a shameless woman".

Ion doubtless did not mean this kindly.⁹³ What about Plutarch? It is possible to take him here as misunderstanding the original, interpreting as generosity what was meant as malice: at first glance, that is what the continuation might seem to suggest—"And the claim was a fair one...", as if Thucydides and the Ion story are in harmony.⁹⁴ But Plutarch expected readers to remember what they had read earlier, and that previous mention of Ion in chapter 5 had already made it clear that Ion was no friend of Pericles but was an enthusiast for Cimon. This is what makes the link with Elpinice, Cimon's sister.⁹⁵ So a reader would naturally take Ion's story as a barb rather than a cheer, indeed a barb picking up precisely on Elpinice's contrast of foreigners and kinsmen. These people Pericles has defeated are indeed not barbarians but kin—"Ionians", one notices, not just "Greeks"—and yet he had the gall to be proud of it! Plutarch caught Ion's drift, but again corrected it, and again used Thucydides to do so: this time in a more roundabout way, using events thirty years later to demonstrate that Pericles had every reason to be proud, and Ion's barb rebounded on himself.

Even that "extraordinary and lofty attitude" ties in. It recalls the "great-mindedness", μεγαλοφροσύνη, that we have seen in Pericles on many other occasions.⁹⁶ Ion may not have liked it: we already knew that too from chapter 5—Ion's dislike for that big, haughty Periclean style. But Plutarch did like it and expected his readers to like it too, not just for what it was but for what it did for others. For such great-mindedness spreads, and Athens as a whole came to share that dignified but grand thinking about itself. We also saw that in chapter 17, where Pericles

⁹³ So Jacoby (1947a) 13–5 = (1956) 163–6, speculating that Ion has twisted something Pericles said not about himself but about the Athenians, probably in the funeral speech of *Per.* 28.4–5.

⁹⁴ That is the impression left by some translations, for example, Perrin (1916): "Ion says that he had the most astonishingly great thoughts of himself... And indeed his estimate of himself was not unjust..."; Ziegler (1994): "*Ion erzählt, der Sieg über die Samier habe Perikles mit ganz besonderer Genugthuung erfüllt... Und er hatte Grund zum Stolz...*" But Scott-Kilvert (1960) gets it right: "Ion says that his victory over the Samians gave Pericles a prodigiously high opinion of himself... In fact, his claim is not so unreasonable..." So also Waterfield (1998).

⁹⁵ Jacoby (1947a) 14 = (1956) 164–5 recognizes the link, though he interprets it in terms of source-material ("The rumours [of Pericles' boastful words] may have come from the same circles as did the alleged dictum of Elpinike..."). Jacoby thought that story did not come from Ion himself (perhaps because he thought that the earlier Elpinice story at 10.5 may come from Stesimbrotus, above note 54); but both stories are as likely to come from Ion as from Stesimbrotus.

⁹⁶ Especially 4.6, 5.1, 8.1, 14.2; we shall see it again at 31.1, 36.8, 38.1 and 39.8. Cf. Stadter (1989) 75 on *Per.* 4.6; Pelling (1992) 35–6nn35–6 = (2002) 138nn38–9.

“encouraged the people to adopt an even bigger mind-set and think itself worthy of great things” (ἔτι μᾶλλον μέγα φρονεῖν καὶ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν πραγμάτων, 17.1), and the Panhellenic conference is the result. It is explicitly “just one example of his mind-set and his great-mindedness”, his φρόνημα καὶ...μεγαλοφροσύνην: and not just his own.⁹⁷ And once again, the example that Pericles sets for Athenians is itself a further metatextual model for what Plutarch's own version can do for his readers. There will always be captious critics, and there will always be other styles for treating events. There were in Pericles' own day, and that is where Ion comes in. But do not be like him, Plutarch tells his readers: adopt Plutarch's mind-set and Pericles' own, not Ion's.

Plutarch's own final verdict on Pericles is, of course, a favourable one, much more favourable than most of the criticisms it quotes, but it is most remarkable for the way it refines and reinterprets even the viewpoints it rejects. Thus even Plato is pressed into service not to denigrate Pericles but on his behalf.⁹⁸ There was a tragic tinge to Plutarch's Pericles too, but not in Ion's manner: it was more a question of the catastrophe that struck his household in his final days (37). There was an Olympian tinge as well, but not in the way that Aristophanes presented him, and again the end of the *Life* makes the point strongly. Plutarch has just expressed admiration for Pericles' dying claim that “no citizen has ever put on black because of me” (38.3–4—a further corrective, incidentally, of Elpinice's gibe):

And it seems to me that there is one thing that prevents that puerile and pompous nickname from being offensive and inappropriate, and that is the way he kept his character gracious and his life pure and undefiled in power: that can genuinely be called ‘Olympian’. It is not unlike the way we expect the gods to exercise rule and sovereignty over whatever exists, given that their nature is to be responsible for good things but not for bad: we should reject the ways the poets confuse us with the most ignorant views possible. Why, they are even refuted by their own stories. They describe the place where the gods live as stable and unbuffeted and untouched by wind and cloud, surrounded perpetually by soft ether and pure radiance, thinking this to be the mode of living best suited for one who is eternally blessed; and yet they describe the gods themselves

⁹⁷ More on this “great-mindedness” of leader and people at Pelling (1992) 25 = (2002) 128–9. It rebounds on Pericles himself at 33.4, when it makes the people over-keen to confront the invading Archidamus: that problem was already looming before the war at 20.3–4.

⁹⁸ Thus Stadter (1989) xliii. Cf. note 81 above.

as full of hostility and anger and other emotions which are not suitable even for mortals who are sensible. But perhaps such reflections are more appropriate to another sort of writing.

(*Per.* 39.2)

Perhaps indeed they are; but the intrusion of a different “other sort of writing” here, again that of the “poets”, reminds us of how easily the godlike may be misread; “hostility” and “anger” typifies the poets’ treatment in one way here. In another, in Plutarch’s own earlier narrative, gods and godlike mortals alike are travestied. So perhaps that word *σεμνοτήτα*, of Pericles’ “venerable” behaviour that Ion so misunderstood (above), was on the right lines:⁹⁹ it was the sort of behaviour that evoked the sort of respect (it is etymologically connected with *σέβειν*, “worship”) more usually associated with the gods. Ion was not wrong in seeing remarkable greatness in Pericles’ mind-set; he was just wrong in regarding it so ungenerously. Others who thought like Ion came to see the error of their ways (37.5), and they are a better model than Ion himself.

Ion

For Plutarch, then, in some moments Ion is distinctively the poet, a man whose flibbertigibbet tastes distracted him from what for Plutarch himself were the crucial points about Pericles. In others, he is the islander, a man whose island sympathies enabled him to put his finger on the crucial points about Cimon. Sometimes the man of political innocence, sometimes of insight: already Ion’s politics are up for grabs. They still are. It is tempting to reconstruct what a man of Chios or of Thasos must have thought about Athens. Jacoby therefore inferred that Stesimbrotus must have been hostile to Cimon; Dover speculated on “what Ion is likely to have thought and felt about the Athenian Empire”.¹⁰⁰ Such ‘must have’s, or even ‘is likely’s, are dangerous. Even if such *expectations* of islanders were justified ones, the most interesting

⁹⁹ It recurs at 7.6, 24.5 (where Aspasia’s trade, admittedly, was not *σεμνόν*) and, significantly, in the penultimate sentence of the *Life* at 39.3: after Pericles’ death, even his critics “came to agree that there had never been a character more moderate in his dignity nor more venerable in his mildness”.

¹⁰⁰ Jacoby on *FGrH* 107, especially Notes, pp. 344–5: cf. above, notes 61 and 77; Dover (1986) 36.

point may be that they were belied by what the authors actually wrote, and we have already seen Plutarch making some capital out of precisely that belying: there were ways of treating islanders imperialistically that did not forfeit their goodwill, at least with islanders like these.¹⁰¹

Yet perhaps even the expectations themselves were never that appropriate. Some authors did let their local sympathies show. Ephorus' Cymocentricity was commented on even in antiquity.¹⁰² But not everyone will believe that Thucydides shows pro-Athenian bias,¹⁰³ and Xenophon and Plato were hardly unqualified admirers of Athens either; and but for the second word of the History, no-one would have identified Herodotean as a Halicarnassean or a Thurian. A Greek *polis* is a small place, and elite friendships and contacts transcended city boundaries. Sophisticated and wealthy persons knew that there was a world elsewhere, and they had their friends and kinsmen elsewhere too. Guest-friend relationships were important, often cemented by intermarriage, as we see in the world of Pindar.¹⁰⁴ According to Gabriel Herman, "[o]vertly or covertly, guest-friendship continued to act as a powerful bond between citizens of different cities and between citizens and members of various apolitical bodies", and "the interests of *xenoi* only rarely coincided with civic interests: structurally and inherently they were opposed to them".¹⁰⁵ That last formulation may overstate the impact of such friendships on everyday internal politics;¹⁰⁶ but the relevance of such inter-city links for *intellectual* life is clear. It was not just Croesus' court at Sardis which attracted visits from "all the foremost intellectual performers (*sophistai*) from Greece" in the mid-sixth century (Hdt. 1.29.1). A snapshot of life a generation later shows the doctor Democedes of Croton at the court of Polycrates at Samos (3.125.1), and a few weeks earlier, the poet Anacreon of Teos had been there

¹⁰¹ As indeed Dover (1986) 36 brings out.

¹⁰² Strabo 13.3.6 = Ephorus *FGH* 70 F236: cf. Barber (1935) 86–8 and, for a particular instance, Pelling (2000) 56.

¹⁰³ See Pelling (2000) 94–103 and especially Rood (1998) 205–48 for more extensive discussion of this, engaging in particular with Badian (1993).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. in particular Kurke (1991) especially pp. 85–162, a fine study of the way in which guest-gifts and marriage are important sites for exploring both intra- and inter-community tension and resolution in the world of Pindar.

¹⁰⁵ Herman (1987) 6, 142.

¹⁰⁶ Reservations in Mitchell (1997) especially pp. 50–1. Exceptional cases could, of course, arise in internal politics too: most famously, Alcibiades could skilfully use his links with Sparta and Argos to wrongfoot his Athenian rival Nicias, and throw inter-*polis* diplomacy into mayhem (Thuc. 5.45 with Herman 1987: 147–50).

too (3.121);¹⁰⁷ and the world of Bacchylides and particularly Pindar is again an international one, with poets and celebrands alike revelling in their cross-community connections. Wider perspectives, and sometimes doubtless clashing perspectives, were naturally possible for men like these—and for the men who knew them. We should not be surprised if political sympathies are sometimes unexpected, and even more often hard to pin down.

What about Ion's sympotic settings? Again, we must remember how little we know: perhaps the sympotic settings have survived in fragments because they happened to carry the best stories, not because all the rest of the work was like that. But if they are typical, is there a political, even ideological message there? That even an islander could get to know such men in a party, and perhaps those Athenian masters were not quite so haughty, not so very different from us islanders? Or is it to down-play politics, that the thing about Cimon or Pericles was not their politics, it was that they were good or indifferent men to know in a party? That Sophocles could laugh about his poor reputation for generalship (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d, above)? That Socrates or Aeschylus was as important a feature of Athens as Pericles? Or is such de-politicization itself a deeply political stance, a waving away of one's countrymen's political concerns that is only possible provided one has the right connections?

We cannot know—but we can suspect that Ion's politics were up for grabs from the outset, that there was never a single, clear answer to that question, any more than there is a single, clear answer to the question of the politicization of sympotic or even epinician poetry. For a Theognis, for a Pindar, perhaps even for an Alcaeus, the values celebrated in poetry could, at least some of the time, be values for a community to share (even if everyone did not share the power), values operating by invitation; even if you were not at the party or did not have the wealth to compete in the games, you were still one of the *polis*, one whose good we in the élite were all, of course, protecting and advancing. Yet for the outsider, social élitism is not outside politics, it *is* politics.

What Ion may mark is, not that those perpetual issues have gone away, nor that inter-city socializing is new, but that the different political perspectives play with a new urgency, and not just on an internal civic society but on the wider world of the Athenian empire. The islands

¹⁰⁷ Herman (1987) 151.

may never have been economically self-sufficient, may always have needed one another, and for some time they may have needed a master as well. They are not socially self-sufficient either, and the social and the political dimensions are now mixing in a way that is more politically questionable, more politically fraught. Not all his countrymen, doubtless, would have applauded the way he was as much 'at home' in his *epidemiai* at Athens as in those at Chios; not everyone would have regarded that social hobnobbing as politically value-free. But we can certainly recognize Ion as capturing a fact of political life that would seldom again be absent from the western world: the international high society of imperial power.

CHAPTER SIX

ION OF CHIOS AND POLITICS

ANNE GEDDES

Introduction

The changes that Athenians made to their system of government in the years between the end of the Persian and the beginning of the Peloponnesian wars shaped the political philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. For that reason alone, if for no other, knowing and understanding the changes is still fundamental to our own political conversation. Unfortunately, however, our knowledge of how the moderately oligarchic system of Cleisthenes turned itself into the democratic system of Pericles is limited, not only because contemporary accounts of what was going on are very meagre,¹ but also because the spirit of our age is so sympathetic to Periclean democracy that it is difficult to take any other point of view seriously. In this paper I will try to use the evidence of an eye-witness who has been comparatively neglected. Ion of Chios was a visitor and saw what was happening; he was a contemporary of Pericles, an admirer of Athens, a friend of Athenians. How sad that

¹ Thucydides wrote a brief account of what had happened in Athens following the end of the Persian Wars in his *Pentekontaetia*, but his purpose was not to explain the politics but rather to show how Athens had grown to be so powerful. Pseudo-Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution*, written in the fourth century, and so dependent on Attidographers, supplements Thucydides' account of the politics of Athens between the wars but inadequately—"disappointing" is Rhodes' word (1984: 66). The only surviving narrative of the events is in the universal history of Diodorus Siculus, whose source for this period was (it is generally agreed) Ephorus, writing in the fourth century. Plutarch wrote *Lives* of famous men, and his access to wide reading enabled him to use and occasionally quote contemporary sources such as Ion himself and Stesimbrotus. The plays, and fragments of plays, are contemporary documents and often refer to or reflect the current preoccupations of the audience. The literature of the fourth century such as the speeches of Lysias and Isocrates, and the dialogues of Plato, refer to the politics of the past, but their main purpose is not to establish the accuracy of the facts. Pseudo-Xenophon, if he was writing early enough, is the only surviving writer who is a contemporary observer of the Athenian political system in action, and whose primary object is to comment on the system, albeit as a polemicist.

of his many writings only a few fragments survive. Few as they are, however, they can shed light on the Athenian politics of his day.

If Ion's fragments can be said to reveal a political point of view, it is one that he shared with his friend Cimon whose politics were moderately oligarchic. Under the influence of Cimon, Athenian politics still (to a great extent) operated in the old aristocratic manner, informally, and person to person. As the system became more democratic, that changed. The Assembly took over more of the tasks of government, procedures became more formal, government more open, the decrees of the Assembly more specific and detailed and the officers of the state more accountable. Ion does not comment on this in anything now available. But two of his stories describe Athenian officers of the state performing their public service in the old aristocratic manner, and thereby they show us, in a small but valuable way, how the system worked.

Of the many bits and pieces of his writing which have survived the centuries, I am concerned here with three in particular. When Plutarch came to write the *Life of Cimon*, he found a story in the works of Ion, who, at the age of about eighteen in c. 466, heard Cimon himself tell it at a dinner in Athens (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6).² Athenaeus, in a section which discusses the love of boys, reproduces a passage of Ion's work *Epidemiai*—*Visits* (Huxley), *Passing Visits* (French), *Sojourns* or *Stopovers* (Podlecki), *Stopping-Off Places* (Woolf)³ or *Dropping In*—in which he reports some of the conversation of Sophocles (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). They were both guests at another dinner in 440, on Chios this time, when Ion would have been about forty-four or a bit less. In addition to these two stories, I will discuss Ion's unfriendly description of Pericles, which was quoted by Plutarch in the *Life of Pericles* 5.3 (109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15). I am going to use these fragments in an attempt to catch a glimpse of the political milieu of Ion. I will begin by considering the kind of literary work to which the fragments might belong so as to establish their purpose, the type of information they can yield and their reliability; I will provide some background about what is known from other sources

² Many suppose that the Cimon story came from the same work, the *Epidemiai*, as did the next story about Sophocles: for example, Jacoby (1947a) 1. West (1985) has proposed a useful chronology of Ion's life, although only two of the dates are firmly fixed.

³ Huxley (1965) 31; French (1971) 8; Podlecki (1987) 9; Woolf (1994) 12; and see Pelling in this volume on contemporary *epidemiai*.

of Ion himself and his political tendencies; and then I will attempt to articulate the light which these three chance records of his work throw upon changes in Athenian politics in the fifth century.

Genre

Ion was born in a world which still, on the whole, remembered the past rather than recorded it. He was a very near contemporary of Herodotus, who wrote in prose, in the Ionic dialect, as he did himself. Herodotus included a great deal of various information in his history of the Persian wars. His technique was to travel widely, and to collect information from the people he met, “gathered in face to face encounters”,⁴ often in the form of one or more of the countless stories which were being repeated by word of mouth in the archaic world in which he travelled; things remembered, family histories, local history preserved in cities, the traditional knowledge of priests and priestesses, and eyewitness accounts of great men and great events. Herodotus did not witness any of the events of the Persian wars; he relied on his sources. But he himself is always present in his history. He talks to his audience and readers, lets us know who told him the story, questions it, gives his opinion on it. Ion, too, lived in a world where everyone wanted to hear a story and most people had plenty to tell. He shares the stories with us as Herodotus does, letting us get to know him, as well as the characters who have talked to him.

The two stories chosen for discussion here are about famous men of the day and that is how Greek biography seems to have started. Momigliano noticed that Herodotus knew more anecdotes about characters like Cambyses, Cyrus and Croesus than he did about any Greek.⁵ He saw the influences that led to the development of Greek biography as coming from the east.⁶ And this led him to say that the practice of remembering the “life” or the “deeds” of famous men came to Greece through Ionia.

⁴ Gould (1989) writes persuasively on Herodotus’ style.

⁵ Momigliano (1993) 34–5: “The impression one forms in reading Herodotus and Thucydides is that interest in biographical details about political figures was more alive in Asia Minor and generally in Ionian culture than in Athens and in other centres of metropolitan Greece during the fifth century BC”.

⁶ Or rather his source noticed: Homeyer (1962) 75–85.

If an interest in biography and autobiography came from the east, something happened to it on the way westward. When Ionians began to write down stories of their own famous men, they had the advantage of living an unusually secular and uninhibited way of life. Ionia seems to have provided the context in which real biography could develop—highly original and innovative, interested in individual personality and feeling, the portrayal of ‘real life’ (as they saw it) as opposed to hagiography or propaganda. Chians claimed Homer as one of themselves, the creator of all too human gods such as Aphrodite and Ares in the *Iliad*, and of thoughtfully characterized and believable characters like Nausicaa and Penelope. Homer’s technique is to let his characters reveal themselves in direct speech. His Ionian descendants, including Ion, often did the same, but they let them speak in prose because that is how people speak: “In Ion’s time prose literature was dominated by Ionic prose”.⁷

The manner of the art as well as of literature in Ionia, it is claimed, was “mimetic”.⁸ Not much has survived from Chios, but the gems signed by Dexamenos of Chios, who was working in the mid-fifth century—just before the classical idealizing style on the Parthenon—are closely observed, and one of them is a portrait:

There had been character studies of aging men in Greek art before but scholars have generally agreed that this is perhaps the earliest of which it might be said that a particular person was intended. If true, this means that he must have ‘sat’, at least for a drawing on which the intaglio is based.⁹

The complex development of Greek art from archaic to early classical is associated with closer observation, and for portraiture, observation is essential.¹⁰

⁷ Dover (1986) 32.

⁸ Fuchs (1986) 275–93.

⁹ Boardman (1970) 195. But Boardman had second thoughts (p. 196) where he discusses another gem on which a similar face is carved, possibly “the same man at different ages”, or maybe Dexamenos was creating “a generalized portrait, a realistic type which may have appealed to his Ionian blood more than the idealising heads of the mainland Greek artists”.

¹⁰ Robertson (1975) 187, writing of the development of the new style, and of portraiture in particular, notes the well-observed “old Priam” of the vase painter Euthymides, and the “portrait” of Themistocles (surviving only in a Roman copy). “[F]rom the kind of experiments towards particularisation seen in the heads of dying fighters at Aegina and Selinus, and more often in late archaic and early classical Athenian vase painting, to portraiture with this degree of individuality [*i.e. in the head of Themistocles*]

Ion was brought up in a region which not only, like its eastern neighbours, showed an interest in the deeds of famous men, but which also encouraged a man of literature to observe what these men were like as something interesting in itself, and to make note of what particular things they said. Gould speaks of Herodotus' stories being collected in the context of hospitality, and so are Ion's.¹¹ The stories about Cimon and Sophocles show these famous men in a relaxed, informal, private setting. They speak freely in the company of friends. In this genre they are themselves, and there is nothing of oratory or drama in what they say. Direct confrontation with a listening audience, such as Ion (and Herodotus) would have experienced, elicits the personal point of view, the intrusion into the story of the writer as well as the people who informed him, that is, his narrators or "focalisers"¹²—sometimes even their own words,¹³ for Ion was a dramatist as well as a prose writer. The two dinner party stories are the literary equivalent of portraits: two moments in time, two snatches of conversation, captured (in this case) by a friendly observer who was looking for the characteristic expression. And they reveal the character of Ion himself too, just as a portrait 'speaks' about the painter as well as the sitter.

When Ion remembers what he had seen and heard, as he seems to be doing in these little pieces from (perhaps) the *Epidemiai*, he is working from life. But there is no evidence that he tried to write the *life* of anyone. In a literate world, biography attempts to provide a broad understanding of the experience of a lifetime; literacy is a prerequisite for true biography. In an oral society, biography can hardly amount to anything more than anecdote, which had the potential to reveal and interpret character, but is likely to be trivial in content and designed for

is not a great step"; "but the development was largely checked by the triumph of the classical ideal" (p. 263)—just as the oral, personal, face-to-face style of Herodotus and Ion was checked by Thucydides, who makes efforts to conceal the process of discovery of information and of himself as investigator, and whose language is as far from what ordinary people said as the figures from the Parthenon are from the man in the street.

¹¹ Gould (1989) 20–1: "the connection between hospitality and the exchange of information is taken for granted by Herodotus. It is, of course, as old as Odysseus' visit to Phaiacia..." Jacoby (*FGH* 392, Commentary, p. 193) compares Ion and Herodotus, recognizing similarities between their writing, but at the same time acknowledging that there is nothing in the fragments of Ion to suggest a philosophy of history such as that which gave form to Herodotus' account of "his enquiries".

¹² Hornblower (1994c) 134.

¹³ Very few of the *ipsissima verba* of Cimon and Pericles would survive but for Ion.

entertainment or for pointing a moral. An anecdote “tells something unusual about a person or a thing. It may involve quotation of a witty remark or description of a remarkable situation”.¹⁴ It is a memorable little story, which is meant to have an effect upon the listener, make him laugh, impress him, scandalize him or simply remind him of someone, as a photograph might. Biographies might contain anecdotes, but they should not consist of them.

Ion surely did not intend his anecdotes to be biographical. The name/s of his book do not suggest biography. The remnants of the *Epidemiai* have prompted some guesswork about what sort of book it was. West thinks that his “book was more an album than an integrated composition”, a series of descriptions of “outstanding Athenians he has met”. Dover sees it as the predecessor of Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* and Plato’s dialogues,¹⁵ although Ion did not have the hagiographic tone which Socrates’ life and death encouraged in later accounts of his life. To me, Ion sounds like John Aubrey, or, rather, James Boswell who went around with Samuel Johnson jotting down the conversations, and whose books are enjoyed and valued because they convey a particular lovable personality in both its wise and ridiculous parts, in the Augustan humanistic manner. Ion’s stories are meant to interest and entertain, and they do so by conveying the character of two famous men. They are the sort of stories that might well appear (in fact the Cimon story did) in biographies such as Plutarch wrote much later; and the quotation from Pericles, too, might have been part of a similar gossip story. But for all his talent in so many genres, Ion was not a ‘biographer’.

If his stories were ordinary anecdotes, no different from any of the other stories circulating in the ancient world, they would not deserve much attention. Saller has warned us of the minimal worth of anecdote as evidence for ancient history.¹⁶ Ion’s little stories are the kind of anecdotes that were generated in the traditional manner. But there are reasons for taking them more seriously than most of the anecdotes of antiquity, such as Herodotus’ stories about Gyges or Polycrates. One reason is Ion’s claim to have witnessed the events himself. He is specific

¹⁴ I am grateful to Han Baltussen for this reference to Taylor (1970) 223.

¹⁵ West (1985) 75; Dover (1986) 34–5: “Ion constructed a new literary form out of two oral forms of narrative conversation and the sayings of wise men” (p. 34). He refers to Aristophanes’ *Wasps*, where Bdelycleon and Philocleon talk about what sort of stories are appropriate to tell, and gives examples such as “when you went to a festival with Androcles and Cleisthenes” (1186–7).

¹⁶ See Saller (1980) 69–81.

about the particular event; he names the hosts, for example. Secondly, he wrote them down in a book which was still read in the Roman world. And thirdly, while he was no doubt writing from memory and may not have remembered the exact words of Sophocles, he conveyed the character of the men and the atmosphere of the event. Even Saller allows that “anecdotes can be valuable evidence for the attitudes and ideologies of peoples”.¹⁷

People are not on oath when they tell an anecdote, especially at a dinner party. In fact, a good dinner guest has practically a duty to make the best of a story. But dinner party stories about known, named people are certainly not meant to be wholly invented. Someone giving what purports to be an eyewitness account is himself vouching for its truth.¹⁸ The face-to-face encounter allows a challenge if the listeners suspect a fabrication intended to deceive. And guests, as well as readers, are practised in making allowances for exaggeration and vanity. Three scraps of conversation have been caught and collected for us from the fifth century, glimpses (to change the metaphor) into a couple of Greek dining rooms. There is no need to doubt that they, or something very like them, did happen. We know enough of the context to give them a little background so as to understand them better, and to discover what they can tell us about the fifth century, particularly the political milieu of Athens. Ion himself does not seem to have—or, rather, the writers who quoted him do not seem to have provided—any political (or, for that matter, any other) motive in recording these scraps of information. But all three fragments involve politics, if only tangentially. All three men were Athenian generals at a crucial period of Athenian political life. Sophocles was not a politician, but he was on official business and his host was the Athenian *proxenos*. Both Cimon and Pericles were leading political figures.

The Fragments

The first passage is about having dinner with Cimon in Athens (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6). Cimon, general of the

¹⁷ Saller (1980) 82.

¹⁸ As Goldhill (2002b) Chapter 2 explains.

allied fleet, tall with thick, curly hair (105* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F12 = Plut. *Cim.* 5.3), a good singer, told a story about what he had done with the booty after the battle around Sestos and Byzantium¹⁹—in fact it is a story of how he won an advantage over the allies. He separated the jewellery and fine clothes of the Persian captives from their naked, out-of-condition bodies, unfit for slave labour, and allowed the allies to choose their portion first. The Samian in charge—Samos was a neighbour and rival of Chios²⁰—chose the jewellery. But later the relatives came down to the coast with ransom for the pathetic-looking bodies, and Cimon was able to feed his sailors for four months and pay over monies into the treasury at Athens as well. Ion's motive for telling the reader this frivolous story can be variously interpreted.²¹ But the story itself is not really the point. It is Cimon who is telling the story, Cimon who said it was the cleverest (σοφώτατον) thing he had ever done. What Ion is doing is giving us the agreeable picture of Cimon being, justifiably, pleased with himself, but at the same time self-deprecating (because the other guests know that he had done plenty of other clever things), entertaining us as well as them.

The second passage is a story about Sophocles at a dinner party on Chios (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). As he was a general at the time, it must have been 441/0. He had been sent by Pericles to negotiate with Chios and Lesbos after the outbreak of the Samian revolt. That revolt was a dangerous moment for the Athenians and for Pericles. Thucydides himself says that Samos came close to taking over the leadership of the league.²² Chios and Lesbos both supplied ships to the Athenians, and if either or both fleets had joined forces with Samos, the Athenians would have had to confront a formidable enemy. Sophocles' negotiations were therefore important. A dinner took place at the home of the *proxenos* for Athens. There was a bit of talk about poetry, about realism—(was that chance or was realism a particularly interesting topic in Chios?)—*versus* convention

¹⁹ That these battles cannot be dated has given rise to much argument. Sestos had been captured already in 479 by another general: Hdt. 2.121. Pritchett (1971) 83: "It is difficult to believe that Ion made the whole thing up". Cf. Jacoby (1947a) 2: "Ion's memory may have played him false".

²⁰ So there was no teasing of Ion as Huxley (1965) 30 suggests there was.

²¹ Duncan (1939) 132: the story is meant "to contrast the versatility and geniality of Cimon and the lack of the graces of society in Themistocles".

²² Thuc. 8.76.4 (in the opinion of the Four Hundred in 411); Plut. *Per.* 28.8.

in poetry, and then Sophocles made a little pretence in order to lure closer the boy who was pouring the wine, so as to snatch a kiss. Ion does not disapprove. He obviously thinks that Sophocles is behaving in an engaging and sophisticated manner. The boy blushed, a sign of modesty much admired among these Greeks, an indication that he was not a practised seducer, not a professional, certainly not if he was a son of the host.²³

The point of the story is not so much the way Sophocles got the better of an argument or succeeded in obtaining the kiss. The point is Sophocles' grace at turning the conversation at an awkward moment²⁴ when the company was laughing at the discomfiture of his literary opponent, by making a joke to his own disadvantage. He said that, since Pericles thought he was no good at strategy, the little stratagem which secured him a kiss on this occasion was good practice for him. The point is Sophocles' likeability. People (as Ion thought) would be interested in this story because Sophocles could talk about poetry, could make a self-deprecating joke; he was a *clubbable* man among his friends. The anecdote, the remembered conversation, is the right way, indeed the only way, to make his likeability real to those who never met him.

These are genial stories about occasions and company that Ion enjoyed. No similar story of his is recorded about Pericles. What evidence there is suggests that he did not like him.²⁵ He compares the *ὀμιλία*, the "company" of Pericles (as when a particular individual might be "good company" and another "bad company") unfavourably with that of Cimon (109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = *Plut. Per.* 5.3).²⁶ Neither the fragment itself nor Plutarch provide any context for the remark. Plutarch dissociates himself from Ion's reflection on Pericles (as Pelling discusses in this volume). He admired Pericles' Olympian manner. Ion, he says, liked goodness to have a bit of the satyr play about it

²³ Bremmer (1990) 139ff. argues that the boys who poured the wine on these occasions were the sons of the host and his visitors (and so this boy may not have been a slave), learning about adult life by attending the parties of their fathers.

²⁴ One of Ion's words of disapprobation, preserved in isolation by Photius was *ἀπειρόκαλος* (121 Leurini = 32A West = *TrGF* 19 F53dd = Phot. *Lex.* α 2304 Th.): "vulgar", "tasteless" (LSJ). See Leurini (1984); Campbell (1992) 367n1: "[i]ncluded among Ion's elegiac fr. by Gentili-Prato [= F10], but it almost certainly belongs to the prose writings, e.g., the *Visits*".

²⁵ Thus Gomme (1945) 358: "Ion did not like Pericles".

²⁶ *ὀμιλία καὶ πολιτεία* is used by Thucydides (1.68.1)—as in *τὸ πιστὸν... τῆς... πολιτείας καὶ ὀμιλίας*...—meaning something like "politics and private life". In oligarchy where affairs are conducted in a personal manner, *ὀμιλία* is an important concept.

(*Per.* 5.4)—a bit of buffoonery—just what we would have expected of Ion, a drinker of wine and a womanizer, a party goer.²⁷ But immediately after quoting Ion's disparagement of Pericles, Plutarch mentions men who "called the pompousness of Pericles a mere thirst for popularity and foolish conceit" (τοὺς δὲ τοῦ Περικλέους τὴν σεμνότητα δοξοκοπίαν τε καὶ τῦφον ἀποκαλοῦντας, *Per.* 5.3). Ion obviously was only one of those who called him names. Elsewhere, Ion quoted Pericles' boast after the defeat of Samos (110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = *Per.* 28.7). And he quoted Cimon's words to Ephialtes when he, Ephialtes, wanted to reject the request for help against the helot revolt after the earthquake (107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = *Cim.* 16.8–10). Cimon wanted to help his friends; Pericles was boasting about himself over the defeat of an erstwhile ally. It might be chance that selected these quotations. Or it may be that Ion had only happy memories of Cimon, and less happy ones of Pericles.

Ion and Oligarchy

Ion was born and lived all his life as a citizen of what Thucydides called a moderate and stable oligarchy in Chios.²⁸ His family has a little recorded history,²⁹ and he was rich.³⁰ There is every likelihood, therefore, that his milieu was what Thucydides would call oligarchic,³¹

²⁷ 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = *Ath.* 436f. (Baton of Sinope *FGrH* 268 F6); *Ael. VH* 2.41.

²⁸ *Thuc.* 8.24.4. An early inscription from Chios, second quarter of the sixth century (Meiggs and Lewis 1988: no. 8), assumes the existence of two councils, one presumably an aristocratic council and the other a 'people's council', which implies a role of some kind in government for the *demos*.

²⁹ His father perhaps had a friendship with Cimon such that Ion could have been introduced to him as a very young man. Jacoby (1947a) 1 thinks he may have been only fifteen at the time of the dinner.

³⁰ West (1985) 73n2 doubts that he gave a jar of wine to every Athenian citizen (as was claimed by T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = *Schol. Ar. Pax* 835) and which is normally taken as proof of his wealth—and indeed there were an estimated 40,000 Athenian citizens by this time. However, his leisure in itself proves adequate wealth.

³¹ There is a certain agreement among modern historians to refer to the aristocrats of the archaic era as aristocrats, and after Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War oligarchs seem to be generally called oligarchs. There is great deal of variety in the way that erstwhile aristocrats are named in the years between the wars. The nobility, the notables are both found, an élite is becoming normal enough. Davies (1978) 114 opts for "gentleman" which well suggests the old-fashioned flavour of ἀριστοκρατία in the fifth century. The successors of Pericles were not gentlemen: "They could have

but which he himself would describe with other adjectives such as εὐγενής (“well-born”), ἀρίστος (“noble”), καλὸς κἀγαθός (“gentlemanly”) or χρηστός (“worthy”). He may not have taken an active part in politics, but his family would belong with the families that did. The Athenian dinner party anecdote shows him at a very young age (too young to have made his way into such distinguished company without the assistance of family connections) having dinner with Cimon whom he admired, and posterity has elaborated the friendship into a kind of patronage, such as when, later, the young men of the Roman oligarchy were ‘taken up’ by successful friends and relatives of their families and travelled abroad with them on official business. Jacoby has made an argument that Ion was with Cimon in the expedition to Ithome (463/2) during which he met the Spartan king Archidamus and wrote a poem eulogizing his ancestry (90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c).³² He is said to have met other famous men of the day like Aeschylus³³ and Archelaus,³⁴ and his wealth provided him with the leisure to be a *litterateur*, and so to win fame.

All his life he was able to enjoy the aristocratic lifestyle that had developed in the archaic age and survived into the fifth century. Murray has described the aristocratic life-style.³⁵ The three aspects that he discusses are symposium (the nobility maintained friendships in associations which ate and drank and enjoyed poetry together),³⁶ sexuality (pederasty and also the practice of strengthening political friendship through marriage) and sport (because aristocrats had the leisure and the means to compete in games at home and away, especially chariot

been gentlemen. Most of the demagogues were rich from owning craftsmen slaves; some such as Kleon and Kleophon were far more aristocratic than any source would have us think...” Sometime in the fifth century, after the writing of the constitutional debate in Herodotus, and before the performance of the *Supplikes* in 423, the Athenians themselves began to use oligarchy in opposition to democracy. See Ostwald (2000). Presumably by that time the class differentiation depended less on birth and more on wealth.

³² Jacoby (1947a) 7–9. “On his staff” (p. 9) seems too formal for the informality of Athenian administration at that time, as does “in Cimon’s entourage”: Huxley (1965) 11. West (1985) 74 prefers a later date, c. 450.

³³ 108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de; *Quomodo adul.* 29f.

³⁴ 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23. See Fletcher in this volume on Ion and Archelaus.

³⁵ Murray (1980) Chapter 12.

³⁶ Associations of men in clubs is an aristocratic activity but Calhoun (1913), especially 17–24, makes it clear that they were not exclusively oligarchic in their politics. Many of the fifth century aristocrats were democratic and would have belonged to clubs of like-minded friends.

racing and hunting). Murray emphasizes their leisure and their wealth and he is, of course, right to do so. But there is much more to be said about, and on behalf of, their lifestyle than that. The talent and taste of the archaic aristocracy as patrons of poets, artists, architects and philosophers had shaped the cultural life and, at least to some extent, the ethical code of the Greek world, and that influence persisted in the fifth century. In addition, men of the old nobility continued to perform many of the tasks of government and administration in their cities.

Any state which was not exacting tribute from an empire could spend only the money it raised from successful warfare, fines, revenues of state property, tolls, harbour taxes, etc.—or from taxing its wealthy citizens.³⁷ Almost every kind of public service had to be performed and paid for by those who had surplus resources. A democratic state is no different from an oligarchic state in this respect, nor the fifth century any different from the fourth. In commenting on Aristotle's discussion of oligarchy, Ostwald brings out Aristotle's affirmation of the essential role played by those who have a surplus of resources in both oligarchic and democratic government.³⁸ The performance of public office was not just a privilege for the oligarchs, something they selfishly monopolized because they had the power of money and birth to do so. It was a duty and a responsibility which, if they were good at it, they performed for the benefit of the other citizens as well as for themselves. A tradition of euergetism encouraged the wealthy willingly, even competitively, to provide largesse for the public, for which they would expect to be rewarded with respect and political support. Without the rich (unless revenues of empire provided alternative funds) there could be very little city life at all, only very simple festivals, no complex drama, no lavish rituals.³⁹ Pindar, in particular, talks as though that is the function of wealth—not so much private enjoyment as public munificence. If he can be so inspired by the winners of chariot races, how much more

³⁷ See Austin and Vidal-Naquet (1977) on the paucity of ways of raising revenue that were available to the Greek city state. They quote (pp. 303–7 with extracts 91–2) a passage from Ps.-Arist. *Oec.* 2.23 which lists desperate measures taken by Byzantium (no date) and Cyzicus in the sixth century.

³⁸ Ostwald (2000) *passim*, but especially Chapter 5§B, where he refers to Arist. *Pol.* 1279b17–19 and 1329a18–21; see also Ostwald (1995).

³⁹ Spartan euergetism is a problem. As leading citizens were not supposed to handle money, how could they give it away? The winners of the chariot races would have been conferring a public benefit, and bread made from wheaten flour and other produce from the land enjoyed in the mess is well known (Xen. *Lac. Pol.* 5.3.4). Presumably, there were other ways of being generous that played within the rules of the constitution.

would all the inhabitants of Attica, not just the citizenry, celebrate and honour a successful general like Cimon.⁴⁰

Pindar naturally concentrates upon the wealth of his patrons. But the surplus resources of even moderately rich men enabled them to spare the time in which to perform public services. The leisure that wealth provided made possible long periods of absence from home as when, for example, a general was on campaign. Sometime about the middle of the fifth century, pay was introduced for some public offices (Ps.-Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 27.3); it was to be a hallmark of the democratic system (Arist. *Pol.* 1299b38ff.; 1317b34ff.). Before that date, no-one had been paid by the state for the performance of state duties. Of course some of those duties could pay for themselves. Men serving abroad might benefit from gifts of one kind or another which could, but might not be, within the law,⁴¹ or from the booty of war. There is no suggestion that wealthy men did not get some return for their generosity with their time and money. But the return did not have to be in material wealth. The nobility of Athens, not necessarily all of them, but all those interested in political life, were competing for good name and influence. For all the differences between the eighth century and the fifth, their perceptions of themselves were not unlike those of Sarpedon:⁴² their great deeds (they might have thought) justified their privileges.

Among the necessary public services, the conduct of war and foreign affairs was of the utmost importance. The generals and other military officers, and special envoys, were still, even under the more ideologically-driven Periclean democracy, elected by the Assembly, rather than selected by the hazard of the lot.

⁴⁰ Kurke (1991), especially Chapter 7: she notes Pind. *Isthm.* 1.41–51, where the poet says that “everyone strains to fend off dread hunger from his belly. But whosoever in contests *or war* [my emphasis] wins luxurious *kudos*, by being well spoken of he receives the highest profit, the peak of the tongue of citizens and strangers” (p. 236). In n26 she calls attention to the expenditure of effort as well as money: “[T]his is precisely the core of epinikian economics: it is not merely money that is at issue but the willing expenditure of all one has and is for victory”.

⁴¹ Pritchett (1974) Chapter 5 sets out the evidence, mostly of a later date. Pritchett (1971) 83–4: “It was probably normal procedure to give a sizable reward to a victorious general”. Davies (1978) 115 notes Antiphon 5.69–70 on an incident when the Hellenotamiai of c. 440–39 (just after Sophocles’ service) were all suspected of stealing public money, found guilty and punished with death (all but one); later they were found to have been convicted on a false charge.

⁴² Sarpedon makes explicit the link between the privileges awarded to himself and to his friend, Glaucos, and their being warriors, spending their time and risking their lives in battle (*Il.* 12.310ff.).

Second, all those offices that bring safety to the state as a whole when they are well performed, danger when they are not, in these offices the common people do not require any share. They do not think that they should share in the generalship by having it allotted nor in the cavalry command. (Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 1.3; tr. Osborne)

The confidence of the *demos* in the good will of οἱ δυνατωτάτοι (“the most powerful men”) which Pseudo-Xenophon describes is remarkable in view of his belief that the “good men” of Athens protected the interests of the “good men” among the allies (1.14.8–10), and it is perhaps a tribute to the loyalty of the fifth century nobility between the wars that they were trusted by the *demos* for these important tasks. The people who elected the generals would be looking for certain qualities in the candidates, including, in at least some of them, military skill and experience. But not all ten of the generals would be needed for military engagements. The others could be used for various tasks such as negotiating with other cities.⁴³ The duties that had to be performed for the state were not yet as specialized as they were to become later in the fourth century. The electors would be looking for the rather general qualities that had proved valuable in the past. The men who went abroad on public business would do well to have the kind of background that would make them companionable and acceptable to their hosts. In the past, and still in the fifth century, many of the candidates would have the advantage of relationships with distinguished families in other cities. The men who entertained notable Athenians in other cities were the same sort of men as they were, for the same sort of reasons.

Sophocles was on official business when we meet him in the fragments of *Ion*. He lacked the right qualities for military command. That was obvious to Pericles, to *Ion* and even to himself (if his good humour at what might have been taken as a slight is anything to go by), and so it was surely obvious to everyone. *Ion* says that he was not skilled or active,⁴⁴ but that he was just like anyone among the χρηστοί (“worthy men”).⁴⁵ He seems to be referring to those recognizable but rather

⁴³ Adcock and Mosley (1975) 155: “Envoys were selected from the politically active circles”, and generals were chosen from the same group.

⁴⁴ Dover’s translation of σοφός and ῥεκτήριος: (1986) 35.

⁴⁵ Dover (1986) 35–6: the word can be used to refer to an aristocrat or simply to someone who is a ‘good’ man in any situation; Dover hesitates to claim that it is used by *Ion* here to specify a socio-economic status. ‘Aristocracy’ however is so intricately

indefinable qualities that were associated with the nobility in general, and saying that that attitude already, while Ion wrote, perhaps towards the end of his life in the 420s, was beginning to look out of date.⁴⁶ Those qualities would have included the easy social manner that would smooth the rough of negotiation as it still does today. Sophocles had already been selected by the lot as one of the Hellenotamiai in 443/2 (*IG I³* 269, line 36), a position in which a certain amount of tact in dealing with the allies was presumably desirable, and had perhaps done well in that position. Nothing is known of his background—no connection with any wealthy or well-known family: “Sophocles’ life is impossible to reconstruct at this stage”.⁴⁷ But a symposium could be a very literary event, and even if Sophocles were not known for anything else, his reputation as a tragedian would have made him a welcome guest to the educated aristocrats of Greece. The visitor from Eretria/Erythrai was clearly anxious to talk poetry with him. He may not have previously met Hermesilaos, the Chian *proxenos* of the Athenians, but he felt at home in his house among his guests; he suited the company at Chios. We do not see Sophocles in the process of conducting the negotiations with the oligarchs of Chios, and have no knowledge of how good he was at it. The official business would have been done elsewhere during business hours—we can assume that the Athenian *proxenos* would have been at the conference table. What we do see is the after-hours entertainment of the Athenian envoy by his guest-friend, in the company of Ion whose family had a connection with at least one Athenian noble house, and at least one other man from an allied city. So we know that Sophocles could enjoy a feeling of fellowship among the right kind of people. And we know that, in the event, the negotiations were successful.

Cimon too, in the anecdote that Ion remembered him telling, was a general but acting in a role that required diplomatic skills. He was head of the allied forces. Being the general of an alliance of touchy Greek states, all of which resented authority, demanded more varied qualities than the simple ability to win battles. Pausanias in 478 had not had those

associated with moral and quasi-moral values that there can be no clear distinction between the two usages.

⁴⁶ Ion’s apparent concession that noble birth was not necessarily the best criterion in the selection of generals is contradicted by Eupolis fr. 384 *PCG* but echoed by Ps.-Arist. 26.1.

⁴⁷ Buxton (1995) 5.

qualities and had been unable to sustain his position with the allies. His failure (and that of Dorcis, his successor) lost Sparta the leadership of the alliance. Cimon, possibly in 477 or 476,⁴⁸ was doing much better and his success, a success for himself personally (to be sure), brought great benefit to Athens too, including the confirmation of Athens as head of the alliance. Cimon was particularly good at these kinds of relationships, and Plutarch emphasizes how well he got on with the allies and how they liked him.⁴⁹ With his Thracian mother and sons called Lacedaimonios, Thessalos and Oulios (or Eleios), he was just the right kind of man to represent Athens abroad. His family must, over the centuries, have built up an extensive network of kinship and friendly relations throughout the Greek world. At 106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6, Cimon was in charge of making the division of spoils and his narrative (if Ion's account is accurate), implies that an equal division between the Athenians and the allies was acceptable to all. Cimon was a great man and he was the general of the allies on campaign; but he got his bargain by being smart, not by the exercise of power. He was treating the allies fairly enough; the Samian leader could have made the better choice if he had been more shrewd, or perhaps experienced. Cimon in action in this anecdote demonstrates none of the 'tyrannical' manner towards the allied cities that was later so much resented. It was not a democratic temperament that enabled him to avoid this manner. It was perhaps due to the fact that when he dealt with the cities of the alliance, he was dealing with men whom he saw as his equals. He probably had more in common with the leaders of the allied cities than he had with the democrats of Athens—although his loyalty to the Athenian democracy was never in doubt.

Ion gives the impression that when he received the ransom from the relatives of the captives, he was able to spend it as he thought fit. The degree of control that, at this period, the authorities in the home *polis* was able to enforce over the general in the field, is not well understood.⁵⁰ The convention seems to have been that the general could distribute

⁴⁸ Jacoby (1947a) 2n4.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Cim.* 6.2; 11.2.6 (although a sinister motive is attributed to him here); 16.3.2–3; and, again, when making the comparison with Lucullus, 2.3.4–5.

⁵⁰ On the list of trials of hegemones provided by Pritchett (1974) 5–10, only three Athenian generals were put on trial before the trial of Pericles in 430. Much of the evidence is from the period of the Peloponnesian War. Pritchett examines "the degree of control of the civil authority over the military" (p. 34). Here, too, most of the evidence available is from that war and the post-war period.

the booty as he saw fit, and the city authorities took control only of what he brought home.⁵¹ Certainly, Cimon profited by his victories, but so did Athens and the Athenians. When he paid the soldiers and provided for the fleet and contributed wealth to the treasury of the city, he was conferring benefit, an almost personal gift, to the Athenians, as aristocrats had done traditionally.

In these anecdotes, Ion recreates the atmosphere of the symposium where the aristocrats spent their leisure and enjoyed their wealth. He shows us that wealth provided them with leisure and education which, in turn, enabled them to create, and have created for them, a literary and intellectual culture. Thanks to him also, we can see these same aristocrats undertaking serious public duties which were vital for the survival of the city.

When Ion was born, Chios and its oligarchic government was much as it had been, but Athens was already changing. In the first half of the fifth century, there was a “revolution” in Greek art,⁵² a “revolution” in philosophy⁵³ and another “revolution” in politics.⁵⁴ The noble families of Athens were changing too: they were the first customers for sophistry; and their political power had been challenged by (among other things) the legislations of Solon and Cleisthenes. But Cleisthenes’ reforms, the introduction of the lot for the selection of archons, and even the reforms of Ephialtes did not abolish the traditional institutions of the government, and they did not destroy the influence of the old families in Athenian politics, although, as the Assembly grew more powerful, the nobility lost power. Many of the leaders, including Pericles himself, were drawn from the ranks of the nobility. Some of them, maybe, would have preferred a more oligarchic style of government, but the reformers were also aristocratic. It was in the conversation of the privileged nobility (some of it remembered in the dialogues of Plato) that the new ideas took shape and, as politics at Athens changed, so did

⁵¹ Pritchett (1971) 85: “Although the evidence is scattered, the conclusion seems safe that the Greek hegemon in the field could dispose of the proceeds from the sale of booty in various ways, from awarding prizes to providing *misthos* for the soldiers; but whatever was brought back became the property of the state”. This might have been an incentive for the general to bring back very little, but the goodwill won by the victorious, booty-laden general among his fellow citizens would encourage him to bring back plenty.

⁵² Robertson (1975) Chapter 4, v–vi.

⁵³ Guthrie (1969) 3.14: the fifth century enlightenment was “an intellectual revolution”.

⁵⁴ Rhodes (1992).

they (but not all of them) change. As our hostile sources tell us, it was not until after the death of Pericles that a different sort of leadership emerged, men who won the support of the *demos* by flattering it and tempting it with offers of public monies,⁵⁵ and by that time there was no need any longer for the former ruling class. By the fourth century, “there was no longer an aristocracy worthy of the name”.⁵⁶ They had engineered their own demise.

There is no evidence that Ion ever articulated any awareness of these changes. There is no evidence that he was ever disenchanted with Athens; what evidence there is suggests the reverse, since his son apparently lost his life for Atticism (T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3). He died before Chios overthrew its oligarchy. But every thoughtful aristocrat in Greece would have been affected by the philosophies which prompted, or at least went hand in hand with, the political changes in Athens. Some of them, like those at Athens, might have re-thought the old justifications for privilege. Some of them would have resented the rise in Athens of what seemed to them a new ruling class. All of them surely would have been aware of what was lost by the changes.

Ion and Pericles

ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς Ἴων μοθωνικὴν φησι τὴν ὁμιλίαν καὶ ὑπότυπον εἶναι τοῦ Περικλέους, καὶ ταῖς μεγαλαυχίαις αὐτοῦ πολλὴν ὑπεροψίαν ἀναμεμεῖχθαι καὶ περιφρόνησιν τῶν ἄλλων, ἐπαινεῖ δὲ τὸ Κίμωνος ἐμμελὲς καὶ ὑγρὸν καὶ μεμουςωμένον ἐν ταῖς <συμ>περιφοραῖς.

The poet Ion, however, says that Pericles had a presumptuous and somewhat arrogant manner of address, and that into his haughtiness there entered a good deal of disdain and contempt for others; he praises, on the other hand, the tact, complaisance, and elegant address which Cimon showed in his social intercourse.

(109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = Plut. *Per.* 5.3; tr. Perrin)

Ion is commenting on the manner of the two men, and, whether or not he himself made the direct comparison between them—the former seems very likely—the comment certainly suggests some positive dislike and disapproval of Pericles. Plutarch seems to think so. He comes to the defence of Pericles, whose manner and statesmanship he admired,

⁵⁵ Ps.-Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 28.3–4; Plut. *Per.* 9.2.

⁵⁶ Ehrenberg (1951) 112.

initially comparing him with Fabius Maximus and especially when summing him up in the final chapter of his *Life*. Having reported the criticism of Ion he adds:

ἀλλ' Ἴωνα μὲν ὥσπερ τραγικὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀξιοῦντα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχειν
τι πάντως καὶ σατυρικὸν μέρος ἔωμεν...

But we must ignore Ion, with his demand that virtue, like a dramatic tetralogy, have some sort of a farcical appendage. (*Per* 5.4; tr. Perrin)

But then Plutarch also admired Pericles' acquired ability never to laugh and repeated, apparently as serious comment, a remark by Critolaus that Pericles did not speak on every matter nor mixed with the crowd, but kept himself "like the trireme the *Salaminia*, for important occasions" (*Per* 5.1, 7.5). Ion is responsible for recording (perhaps he heard himself) the words of Pericles after the defeat of Samos. After the battle he thought himself θαυμαστὸν δέ τι καὶ μέγα ("astonishingly great"): Agamemnon had taken ten years to conquer Troy but he—he is supposed to have said—had defeated the Samians, the most important and powerful city of the Ionians, in only nine months (110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = *Per*. 28.7).

Plutarch defended Pericles, as indeed do most modern historians.⁵⁷ Jacoby goes to considerable trouble to cast doubt upon or explain away the words Ion attributed to him: "we cannot deny that Ion may himself have heard Perikles pronounce the words in question. But did he? And did Perikles really say what Ion made him say? I cannot get rid of the suspicion that this was not the case".⁵⁸ Pericles' reputation still stands and his domestic policies have very few critics in the present time. The aspersions that Ion is making about Pericles are conceivably apolitical and purely personal. A sociable man like Ion, apparently not interested in politics, let alone political theory, might simply not have liked him. But there are plenty of other reasons why someone of Ion's general background, and an islander, might have disliked Pericles. In this section, I will try to provide some possible explanations for why Ion chose those particular words to express his disapproval.

Some of the words are quite unusual. μῦθον is a licentious dance and μοθώνικος, a word found in comedy, refers to impudent buffoons

⁵⁷ Ehrenberg (1954) 87: "This astonishing and probably unfair description..."; Huxley (1965) 35: "Yet the supposed boast may be no more than a piece of gossip amongst extremist clubmen in Athens which made its way to Chios in 439".

⁵⁸ Jacoby (1947a) 14.

and tricksters. It seems quite inappropriate as a description of Pericles' social behaviour, especially as Plutarch is quoting the word in the same passage in which he speaks about his golden tongue and Olympian manner. Commentators have felt the incongruence because, when this passage is translated, it is normally taken as virtually synonymous with *ὑπότυφος* which is normally translated as some variation of arrogance.⁵⁹ *μόθωνες* and *μόθακες* are Spartan words. Huxley suggests that *μοθωνική ὁμιλία* (lit. "presumptuous company") was "an expression perhaps current amongst philo-Laconians in Athens who borrowed it from their noble Spartan friends' complaints about the servant problem".⁶⁰ But whatever they were, *mothakes* were not servants. There is no knowing the work in which the passage was included. Huxley's supposition that the work was written for an esoteric oligarchic readership is supported by no evidence. Pseudo-Xenophon's *Athenian Constitution* might well have been intended for that kind of readership, and then 'escaped' by chance into the public arena. But Ion's work seems to have been intended for a more general public (not for Athenians, West tells us, but for Chians and other Ionians or even for posterity),⁶¹ and this is even more likely to be the case if the passage is from the *Epidemiai* or anything like it. *ὑπότυφος* is also a rare word; it is translated in LSJ as "somewhat arrogant". But the root meaning is "smoke coming from below". The metaphor might have lost all force when Ion used it, but the smoke might still elicit the idea of clouded understanding, and so an English equivalent might be "vain" or "pretentious". Whatever their meaning, the two words, so carefully chosen, and chosen again by Plutarch for quotation, should not be synonyms, and both of them should be distinguished from *μεγαλαυχία* ("boasting", "arrogance").

The precise reference of the words *mothax* and *mothon* in the Spartan context is not known (although its resemblance to *μόθος*, a battle, encourages a translator to forget the licentious dance and to think of warriors). The ancient sources called them foster brothers, *σύντροφοι* of the Spartiate citizens, free men who had been brought up in the *agoge*

⁵⁹ Scott-Kilvert (1960) 169 translates "rather disdainful and arrogant"; Ehrenberg (1954) 87: "impudent and puffed up"; Stadter (1989) 79 says that *μόθων* or *μόθαξ* are Spartan words for an illegitimate Spartan son, but then adds that it came to be used of those who were "vulgar, presumptuous, or impudent", without further comment.

⁶⁰ Huxley (1965) 34–5 and 34n30: "The tone of these remarks hardly befits the period of Pericles' Olympian dominance; but Athenian Tories may well have spoken thus about him while he was in the ascendant, ca. 465".

⁶¹ West (1985) 76.

with their full status 'brothers'.⁶² So much is agreed. *Mothakes* came from one or more of the numerous groups of non-citizens, disadvantaged in some way—free boys who would have missed out on the *agoge* and so would have failed to become citizens, but for acquiring a patron. Some have argued that they were the illegitimate children of Spartiates born to helot mothers, who had been acknowledged by their Spartiate fathers, brought up in the *agoge* with their half-brothers and allowed to fight in the army where Xenophon saw them in 382 (*Hell.* 5.3.8). This is the position of Ogden, who argues the case that there is no difference between Spartan *nothoi* ("bastards") and *mothakes*.⁶³ Another theory is that they were, or could, include the children of Spartiates who had fallen out of the group because of poverty or for some other reason.⁶⁴ The evidence is complex, but set out clearly by Ogden. That some *nothoi* were acknowledged and supported by, presumably, their Spartiate fathers and brought up in the *agoge* is attested in a passage of Xenophon. But that they fell into a group which were called *mothakes* strikes many scholars as improbable. In the late fifth century, Lysander, Callicratidas and Gylippus are all called *mothakes* and it would be surprising, surely, to find that, at a time when posterity knows so few non-royal Spartans, three powerful generals and navarchs (Lysander in particular intimately connected to the family of one of the kings—and maybe aspiring himself to become a king?) were illegitimate, born of helot mothers.⁶⁵

Whether they were illegitimate or impoverished, it is not at all clear why they should be especially arrogant or disdainful. Foreigners found many Spartans arrogant, not just those said to be *mothakes*. It seems to me that any insinuation that Pericles' *homilia* was similar in any way to the manner of any Spartan whose mother was a helot, given his Alcmaeonid mother and blue blood, misses its mark. But if *mothakes* was a name for the illegitimate sons of wealthy fathers who were willing to support them through the *agoge*, but from whom they would not inherit land, or the children of impoverished Spartiates whom poverty

⁶² Phylarchus *FGrH* 81 F43, Ael. *VH* 12.43.

⁶³ Ogden (1996) 218–24.

⁶⁴ Toynbee (1969) 343–6; Cartledge (1987) 28; MacDowell (1986) 46–51; Lotze (1962) 427–35.

⁶⁵ Kings are accused of illegitimacy fairly frequently, although to my knowledge, not of having helot mothers, because that was one of the very few ways they could be dethroned.

had driven out of the citizen group, but who had found a patron (as Lysander maybe did in the family of Agesilaos),⁶⁶ or both of the above, then something that all of them would have had in common is some degree of poverty. Rich men, those who could afford to make donations to the common mess of wheaten cakes or the kill brought home from hunting (Xen. *Lac. Pol.* 5.3)—on their horses, with their hunting dogs, on their country estates, with all the accoutrements of wealth—might well pay for the training of their illegitimate sons, or the sons of poor friends, or relatives, who had fallen out of the group, but the young men themselves, whether they were foster brothers or half-brothers, would not be able to afford any extras. They were poor contributors to the shared meal and not so welcome in the mess as a rich and generous fellow-diner might be.

Sharing food and drink was so important in the social life of all Greek oligarchies that those who took, but did not give, would have earned contempt, however blamelessly. And the word could be more easily understood as an accusation of Pericles as (the same metaphor works in English) ‘poor company’. He was in fact a wealthy man, but he acted as if he were poor—in fact he did not go out to dinner at all. The only time he did go out, to a family wedding, he left early:

He refused not only invitations to dinner but every kind of friendly or familiar intercourse, so that all through the years of his political career, he never visited one of his friends to dine. (Plut. *Per.* 7.4–5; tr. Scott-Kilvert)

And presumably he did not himself entertain at home. His daughters-in-law complained about the niggardly way he provided for them and about his strict accounting methods (*Per.* 16.4). Cimon, on the other hand, was generous with hospitality and food, inviting men to eat his fruit and entertaining many people, including the poor, at dinner every day.⁶⁷ There is no evidence for assigning this meaning to *mothnikos*, but in Spartan history plausibility is often the best that can be done, and the appearance of poverty at least establishes some difference between the *μοθωνική ὁμιλία* and the *ὑπότροφος*.

The other metaphors in this report of what Ion said are also striking. Cimon was *ὕγρός*, moist or wet, meaning something like “easy-going”,

⁶⁶ As proposed by Cartledge (1987) 28–9.

⁶⁷ Plut. *Cim.* 10.1–6. Rhodes (1981) 338: “Cimon’s generosity was notorious”.

perhaps, at his social gatherings.⁶⁸ The word ὑγρότης occurred to Plutarch on another occasion when he was making a comparison between Cimon and Lucullus: "...open-handed abundance in their fondness for entertaining and their generosity to others" (ἡ περὶ τὰς ὑποδοχὰς καὶ τὰς φιλανθρωπίας [ταύτας] ὑγρότης καὶ δαψίλεια, *Cim.* 3.3, tr. Scott-Kilvert). But the English word "easy-going" does not convey the charm that the Greek word seems to convey. The other two adjectives, ἁρμονίης "harmonious" (as in music) and μεμυσμένος "polished" (as in poetry), also convey the pleasures of his company.

There is nothing overtly political in Ion's criticism of the manner of Pericles or his praise of Cimon. In his description of Sophocles, however, he says that he was one of the χρηστοί, a sound man, "one of us" as Sir Humphrey would say. This was perhaps the nearest that Ion got to making a political statement.⁶⁹ Nothing else in the evidence suggests any interest in politics, apart from his acquaintance with politicians. He was φιλοπότης ("fond of drinking") and ἐρωτικώτατος ("amorous": 94 Leurini = *FGH* 392 T8 = 31 West = *Ath.* 436f; *Ael. VH* 2.41)—a sociable man, who enjoyed a drink and good mixed (as we say in English) company, as did Cimon. On the other hand, his family background in Chios must have made him aware of political affairs, and he was alive until (about) the end of the Archidamian War, so he could not have ignored politics altogether. There were plenty of reasons why men from an oligarchic background should have disliked Pericles.

From Chios (440) to Melos (416)

By the end of the century, the old-fashioned nobility of Athens had lost its grip on the political process and its loss was brought about largely by Pericles, who dominated the assembly. It was ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή ("in reality... rule by its foremost citizen", *Thuc.* 2.65.9). Thanks to his golden tongue, he was able to rule without the help of family and friends to support him against aristocratic opposition. The

⁶⁸ ὑγρός was a versatile word, the opposite of stiff, used for the figure of Eros at *Pl. Symp.* 196a, and of melting or languishing or brimming eyes.

⁶⁹ West (1985) 76 has suggested that the three qualities which Ion proposes as basic principles of the cosmos (*sunesis*, *kratos* and *tyche*) do in fact have a political implication because they are qualities that a statesman needs. The qualities in themselves however do not say anything about any particular political situation or particular person.

policy changes which brought about the extreme democracy were attributed by Pseudo-Aristotle to his influence (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1). He presided over the transformation of the Delian alliance into empire, the falling-out with Sparta, and a 'revolution' in the government of Athens. This last was characterized by, among other things, pay for office and a shift from private largesse to public finance, and it was accompanied by much tighter control of the executive arm by the Assembly.⁷⁰

Ion's stories are about two generals who were still, during these critical years, operating as the oligarchs used to. When their *modus operandi* is compared with what came later, the extent of the changes becomes apparent. The oligarchic approach was personal, informal. The changes involved loss of personal relationships in city government and in inter-city negotiation. The Assembly took over responsibility for policy and the oversight of its execution by officials. And the ruling class of the past suffered loss of autonomy in the performance of such public service as they continued to perform.

When Sophocles was negotiating in Chios, friendship—or, if not friendship, friendliness—eased the formality of the proceedings and maximized the chances of agreement. Of course, there would be disagreements; competition for power and resources and every other human frailty would persist under oligarchic rule, as it always had done, but the causes of hatred would not yet have been ideological. The aristocracies agreed with each other on principles.

Very different from Sophocles are the Athenian envoys who took part in the Melian dialogue (Thuc. 5.84.3–113). There are, of course, many other differences which render inappropriate any close comparison between Sophocles in Chios and the Athenian envoys at Melos. Much had happened in the years between 440 and 416, and Melos was a very different island, much less powerful than Chios. Athens did not need alliance with Melos as it had done with Chios in 440. Even

⁷⁰ Davies (1978) Chapter 4 uses the public documents of Athens, which begin to proliferate from about 460, to demonstrate the changes that took place: "This explosion of documentation tells us various things...most important of all, the documents reveal the power of the Assembly as *the* effectively sovereign governing body" (p. 66). Some of the documents were the result of Athens' new tasks in the administration of an empire: "However the larger part comprises a firm subordination of that [administrative] apparatus to the organs of popular government in a way which involved older magistracies and institutions in major trauma" (p. 72). See also Pritchett (1974) 127–8: "Certainly the evolution in the policy of financial regulation of the Athenian strategoi was one of increasingly tighter control".

so, a comparison might illustrate the nature of some of the changes in the Athenian government system that had occurred between the two incidents.

It is particularly frustrating not to know anything about the envoys who went to Melos, especially since they might have been friends of Thucydides, or at least have spoken to him about it.⁷¹ Thucydides begins by making a little business of the politics of the two sides. The oligarchs of Melos want to talk to the ambassadors alone. The democratic Athenians know that the full Assembly would be easily persuaded to their point of view by the rhetoric of a long speech. Thucydides, in his sympathy for these oligarchs, is drawing particular attention to the difference in decision-making between oligarchy and democracy, exemplified by the calm private discussion as opposed to the oratory delivered in the assembly. He himself probably agreed that a small meeting, which would allow question and answer, would be more likely to bring out the real attitudes and assumptions of the participants, and the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments—whereas a democratic assembly would do nothing but succumb to the spin.

The Melian arguments are full of old-fashioned aristocratic values. The Athenians begin by warning the Melians against them: οὐ γὰρ περὶ ἀνδραγαθίας ὁ ἀγὼν (“it is not a contest about honour”: 5.101). The gods, the Melians think, will be favourable to them because they have a just cause, the Spartans will come to help them because of kinship, a sense of honour (104) because they are colonists of the Spartans (106) and because of a similarity of beliefs (108). They use the ideas and the words of personal relationships that might well have been persuasive in the past. The envoys of the democrats of Athens were obviously highly educated, and therefore likely enough to have been leisured and so ‘gentlemen’. But this generation of the nobility, or at least these individuals, had lost contact with what it was like to be an aristocrat in the old manner. Like Callicles in the *Gorgias*, they had picked up the language and attitudes of at least some of the sophists. As democrats they were at odds with the Melian oligarchs. There is no sense in the dialogue that they could, other things being equal, have been friends,

⁷¹ It has been suspected that Thucydides invented the speeches of the dialogue in order to make some point of his own. Even if that is the case, Thucydides must have tried to make it plausible if he wanted his Athenian readers to take him seriously; and for my purposes that is sufficient.

or that they were in any way in tune with each other. The dialogue is as different as could be from the conversation over dinner at Chios.

We will never know how much independence of negotiation Sophocles was allowed—whether he was able to offer some inducements, make some promises. In general, in the earlier period, the officers of the Athenians had had a great deal of latitude when they were away.⁷² Themistocles, for example, went alone to Sparta to negotiate the rebuilding of the Athenian walls. The Assembly was not unaware of his plan, but he had the authority to play it by ear (Thuc. 1.90–2). Miltiades apparently was given the option of declaring war on Paros, or any other place, without telling the Assembly where he was going (Hdt. 6.132ff.), and in 446 Pericles himself was able to come to a financial arrangement with Pleistonax (not proven) without consulting the Assembly (Plut. *Per.* 22.3).⁷³ As we have seen, Ion shows Cimon making his own decisions about the booty. The Assembly in those days could punish the aristocrats who failed, or who implemented policy it found it did not like, but it did not yet seem to spell out the detail of their operations. The ambassadors to Melos, on the other hand, were messengers of the Assembly. A decree had been passed by the Assembly back in Athens and the task of the ambassadors was to announce the terms to the Melians and get a reply. There are signs that the Athenians at Melos did in fact want the Melians to yield—they were “humanitarians” in Bosworth’s reading.⁷⁴ They begged the Melians to consider their safety. They knew that they had vastly superior force and they could have afforded to make little or no effort to persuade. But they did make an effort. They persuaded vigorously and at length. Finally they left in frustration and anger (if that can be detected in 5.113). But persuasion was their only option. They could not offer a deal in the hope of reconciling the Athenians to it later, as their predecessors might have done; they could not negotiate. They were bound by the written decree, and the Assembly, which now dominated Athens and had sent out these men, did not share Melian values, any more than did the ambassadors themselves.

⁷² Problems of communication with the home base normally made it necessary to allow the generals in the field a good deal of latitude. Transgressions could be dealt with when they returned home.

⁷³ Cf. Thuc. 2.21.1 and Ephorus, cited by the scholiast on Ar. *Nub.* 859 = *FGrH* 70 F193.

⁷⁴ Bosworth (1993) 43.

Conclusion

The democracy operated impersonally and formally where the oligarchy had been personal and informal. The personal approach persisted to some extent because the friendships and relationships between families did not disappear in a few years. But the democracy in time eliminated the personal relationships and made government business more formal. The modern narrative of the revolution often greets the written regulation—as opposed to the undefined whim of the oligarchy—as unqualified progress. But like everything else, it had its disadvantages. It took the initiative out of the hands of the men who had been brought up to public service and turned them into messengers. When they returned home, their actions and their accounts would be scrutinized by the people, and they would have to justify them, at some danger to themselves. The courts in Athens could always prosecute them and then they would have to act in the way Aristophanes described, pleading with men whom they would, in the old days, have considered their inferiors, poorer and less well-born and educated than themselves. The old-fashioned men of family had reason to drop out of active public service because the nature of the service had changed. The new system robbed them of their sense of autonomy in serving the public, and thereby of their ability to win respect and popularity. In the democracy, some of them—the ones who had not been converted to a new way of thinking—might have thought to themselves, bitterly, that their democratic competitors would do for money what they had done for honour and respect. They were the losers, but the system also suffered the loss of their expertise and experience.

If the oligarchs of Athens felt disenchanted with the new system, even more so must have been the oligarchs among the allied states as the Athenian democracy became more stridently imperialistic. They had no chance at all of influencing the politics of Athens. In fact, they now had to send offerings for the Panathenaic procession as tribute-bearing subjects—which is how they had come to feel. To men who had felt themselves the equals of their fellow oligarchs in Athens, the citizenship law of Pericles must have been particularly humiliating. In 451 Ion was about thirty-two, about the age for getting married, if he was not married already. The law was not retrospective and so was not an immediate attack on the aristocracy with their ‘foreign’ wives. By 451 everyone in Athens, rich or poor (now that metics living there were so numerous), had the chance to marry into a non-Athenian

family. In the past, legitimization of a child's citizenship had been in the hands of the father, the *phratry* and the *genos*.⁷⁵ Under Pericles' law, the state assumed the prerogative of deciding who could be a citizen. Men like Ion in the past might have married their daughters into the Athenian aristocracy. That would have been a considerable advantage to himself as Athens became more powerful, and might well have been an advantage to the Athenian bridegroom and his family. But that option was no longer likely to be available to him. And as Athenian girls were now needed for Athenian men, he was himself less likely to have a chance of marrying into an Athenian family (if he was not married already). The new law undermined the mechanism by which Athenian aristocrats could make friends with fellow aristocrats all over Greece. It encouraged (or expressed support for) a sense of loyalty to the state of Athens rather than to family or to class. Athens was an imperial city now, the Athenians were being asked to think of themselves as autochthonous,⁷⁶ and Pericles was trying to focus the loyalty of the citizenry on the city instead of on family or class.

The aristocrats of many of the cities of the empire, who had dealt in the past with fellow aristocrats, now had to deal with Athenian democrats. Chian oligarchs during Ion's lifetime did not have to please or placate the Chian equivalent of the Athenian ὄχλος δημότικος ("common mob") for whom perhaps they had little respect. But they had to deal with Athenian democrats who, from the middle of the century, had begun to act more like rulers than allies. The Delian alliance had never quite been an association of equals, but some Chians (like Ion maybe) were likely enough richer and more aristocratic than some Athenians, and they used to meet rich and aristocratic Athenians on equal terms. But now Pericles, who never went out to dinner, Pericles with his arrogant manner, and men like him, were presiding over a new kind of democracy and they were in charge of its policy. The empire and especially the tribute it brought in was more important to the late fifth century democracy than it had ever been when the oligarchs were influential. Another power relationship grew in importance—the superiority of Athenian over ally took the place of the superiority of the

⁷⁵ Ogden (1996) Chapter 2.

⁷⁶ The evidence is plentiful from the middle of the fifth century onwards, especially in funeral orations. See Loraux (1986); Tyrrell and Brown (1991).

aristocrats of any city over poorer or less aristocratic citizens in their city—and the allies came to hate their Athenian ‘rulers’.

What is more, Periclean policies led to the Peloponnesian War. Ion had belonged to a more panhellenic world which was disappearing as more of the Ionian cities became democracies under the influence of Athens. He had been a friend of Cimon who drove the Athenians mad by keeping on about how wonderful Sparta was (Plut. *Cim.* 16). It was he who recorded the words of Cimon calling for friendship and co-operation between the two greatest cities of the Greek world, words which would have been remembered as Athens and then Sparta exhausted themselves with warfare. No wonder Ion, an islander and an oligarch, disparaged Pericles.

Later, and in view of some of the consequences, Thucydides tried to understand the complexities of what was happening. Ion was not that kind of man. He may or may not have understood what was going on but he could see the changes. The glimpses he provides into his own view of the world and what he saw and heard from his friends are much more important than he probably realized. He spoke as an islander loyal to Athens, but not unaware of what was happening in the empire, and also as an oligarch who can give us a rare glimpse of what was lost when the different politics of Pericles sidelined the old families who had managed politics in the past. He is so illuminating precisely because he does not seem to have thought it out in any abstract way. He wrote in a different genre. He just tells us about dinner parties he had enjoyed, and in that way he lets us see his world as he and the other guests saw it.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ION THE WINEMAN: THE MANIPULATION OF MYTH

GUY OLDING

Introduction

In this essay I examine Ion's mythological writing. This will cast light on the nature of the genre, Ion's place in Greek literary tradition and on his own social and political allegiances. The fragments of his mythography can provide considerable—if inferential—illumination on the beliefs and objects of Chios, a significant, if secondary, state in the Greek world. I aim to provide an outline of Ion's method of allusion and explicate the manipulations—if that is not too strong a word—of meaning that we shall witness in his work.

It need hardly be said that Greeks did not regard their myths and traditions simply as fairy-stories and fictions. Nor were they quite the same as history. Their veritable antiquity and fabulous elements did not necessarily discredit them, but instead rendered them, perhaps, 'hyper-real'. They provided the cultural and psychological basis for cultural and ethnic identity, customs and political and social arrangements. They are often used to suggest the existence of relationships or to assert specific political claims, a well-attested feature of Greek cultural production.

I shall not deal with the fragments of Ion's tragedies, which are better treated in the context of their genre. Of greatest significance is his prose work, the *Foundation of Chios* (*Chiou Ktisis*), which is represented in three fragments. Pausanias provides a lengthy paraphrase (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10) and short fragments are preserved in the *Etymologicum Orionis* (97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etym. Or.* s.v. λόγῃ) and Athenaeus (99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e).¹ Also

¹ von Blumenthal counts Aelian's memorable description of a monstrous serpent on Chios (*HA* 16.39) as a fragment of Ion's *Foundation* (17 von Blumenthal); Leurini lists it among "doubtful" fragments (128** Leurini); Jacoby calls it "anonymous" (*FGrH* 395 F1). von Blumenthal's suggestion that it could belong to Hellanicus of Lesbos (who also

significant is a fragment of Ion's elegiac verse that Plutarch cites in his *Life of Theseus* (96* Leurini = 29 West = *Thes.* 20.2). This is not strictly comparable to the *Foundation*, as it comes from a different work, in a different genre, produced on a different occasion and presumably with a different intent. However, being a relative clause, it was probably an incidental remark and can therefore be assumed to conform to Ion's general views about Chios' legendary past.² Indeed, there is a view that 96* Leurini belongs to the *Foundation* anyway (though I reject this).³

These fragments seem to relate Chios' traditions with a view to enhancing her position in the Greek world. Chios' position as second-ranked power did not stop her citizens from thinking big. One particularly interesting thread is the view it presents of Athens. This has a number of aspects: the attitude of a significant minor player towards a political, military and cultural heavyweight; towards the political structure that connected the two in the fifth century, the Delian League; towards her fellow allies. Moreover, this relationship had a personal dimension. Ion's friendship with the famous Athenian statesman and general Cimon is well known. It is in this last context that I shall, in the final part of this chapter, consider the significance of a possible reference to Ion by Thucydides (T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = *Thuc.* 8.38.3). It seems that Ion employed mythological allusion outside the literary field to describe his own personal relationships.

wrote a *Chiou Ktisis*: *FGrH* 4 F71) does not exhaust the possibilities. I omit it because its subject matter is fantastic, not mythical.

² Jacoby (1947a) 5.

³ To identify 96* Leurini = 29 West = *Plut. Thes.* 20.2 as belonging to the *Foundation* requires that the whole work be poetic, which seems at odds with the evidence that (1) the one surviving direct quotation is prose (97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etym. Or.* s.v. λόγῃ). This *can* be made metrical by emendation (Cerri 1977), but the same could be said of many samples of Greek prose: see Dover (1986) 32. (2) Where the *Foundation* appears in lists of Ion's works, it is located with other prose works; (3) Pausanias refers to it as a συγγραφή (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = *Paus.* 7.4.8; Jacoby 1947a: 5). While there are a few cases where συγγραφή refers to poetry (see Leurini 2000a *ad loc.*), it is more commonly used of prose works (references in *LSJ* s.v.); moreover, the συγγραφεύς is often contrasted to the ποιητής (cf. *Pl. Phdr.* 235c; *Dem.* 60.9; *Dion. Thrax Gram.* 1; *Strabo* 14.1.35). Dougherty (1994) debunks the notion that a genre of foundation poetry with particular characteristics ever existed—widely assumed since Schmid (1947).

The Uses of Myth: The Example of Pherecydes

Tracing the allusive force of myth is an inexact science. Even were it possible to map a society's complete inherited cultural roots, it would still not be possible to state positively that any given arrangement would actually be interpreted in any particular way. The method of tracing mythological allusions involves establishing what cultural data existed, what new arrangements mythographers offered, and how different versions and innovations were likely to have been understood.

There are many examples of the use of myth for explicit political purposes throughout the classical period.⁴ Pherecydes of Athens wrote perhaps the first extensive mytho-historical genealogy in prose around 500 BC.⁵ He provides a useful parallel to Ion on account of their shared interests and approximate contemporaneity. His versions of Theseus' myths and the legendary genealogy of the Athenian general Cimon have unusual details that coincide with known Athenian interests, thus making their political overtones blatant. Theseus was the recognized pan-Athenian hero by the end of the sixth century and in this capacity he was regularly enrolled into performing services in the national interest.⁶ Pherecydes involved him in the Athenian claim to Salamis,⁷ stating that he was married to Aias' mother Phereboea, which, by implication, makes Aias, the Salaminian hero, Theseus' son.⁸ It is possible that this is not Pherecydes' outright invention, as other sources associate girls with very similar names with Theseus. A vase dating to c. 570 BC shows an "Epiboia" performing the "Crane dance" with Theseus,⁹ and Bacchylides names an "Eriboea" as a fellow hostage of the Cretans.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Pherecydes has rejected the most ancient and widespread tradition, represented by Homer, that Aias is the son

⁴ For example, Hdt. 9.26–7; Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.6, 6.5.46–7; Aeschin. 2.31.

⁵ Pherecydes' date: Jacoby (1947b) 30–3 with the references in Barron (1980) n7.

⁶ Theseus' development as Athenian national hero: Connor (1970); Walker (1995) 35–81.

⁷ Cf. earlier Athenian attempts to appropriate Salaminian traditions: Arist. *Rhet.* 1375b; Plut. *Sol.* 10.1–2.

⁸ Pherecydes *FGH* 3 F153. No source directly attests that Theseus fathered Aias, but a number explicitly attest that he married his mother, variously called Meliboea, Periboea or Eriboea (Istros *FGH* 334 F10; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.7; Plut. *Thes.* 29). Pherecydes' "Phereboea" is clearly a variation of this name (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 29; Paus. 1.42.2); see *RE* s.v. "Eriboia", "Meliboia", "Phereboia".

⁹ *ABV* 76.1, Florence 4209.

¹⁰ Bacchyl. 17.14; Barron (1980) 2.

of Telamon. Furthermore, Pherecydes describes Theseus sacrificing to Apollo Oulios and Artemis Oulia before leaving for Crete.¹¹ “Oulios” happens to be a cult name of Apollo in several Aegean cities, Delos, Miletos and Lindos. Elsewhere Pherecydes, listing the generations of the Philaidae, the Athenian *genos* derived from Aias, deviates from Hesiodic genealogy to insert an Oulios.¹² Contemporary Philaidae included the generals Miltiades and Cimon, and the only historical Oulios known is Cimon’s son. In view of this rarity, Pherecydes’ references can hardly be coincidental. It appears that he was referring to contemporary Athenian affairs to suggest that there was a divine sanction for Athenian interests in the Aegean and the pre-eminence of Cimon’s family, further implying that the two were related.¹³ We shall have occasion elsewhere to examine the mythological data that underpinned Athenian claims to primacy in Ionia.

The Foundation of Chios (1): Chios and Teos

Pausanias’ paraphrase of the *Foundation of Chios* concerns the settlement of the island, starting with the eponymous Chios, and includes Oinopion, the legendary founder who came from Crete with his sons (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10; see Haviaras in this volume for the translated text). The *Foundation*’s other fragments seem to involve Chios’ claims in the Ionian-Aegean region. Orion quotes from it to illustrate the meaning of the term λόγχη: ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγχης λόγχας ποιεῖ πεντήκοντα, “He allotted fifty shares from the share of Teos” (97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etym. Or.* s.v. λόγχη).¹⁴ This seems to refer to the creation of land divisions in Teian territory. Such divisions did, in fact, exist, whatever their exact form and significance might have been, if these are to what the twenty-six-plus *purgoi* (divisions) on a second

¹¹ Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F149.

¹² Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F2; cf. Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F22.

¹³ Davies (1971) 306–7. On Cimon’s apologists’ possible exploitation of the Theseus legend, see, for example, Connor (1970) 157–66.

¹⁴ The text is that of von Blumenthal (1939) fr. 19. On this text’s problems see Leurini (2000a) 60, who prefers ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγχης λόγχας πόρε πεντήκοντα; Gentili and Prato (1985) 68 (= 7 G.-P., who attach it to 96* Leurini = 29 West); Theodoridis (1979) 17; and Blanshard in this volume.

century Teian inscription refer. The Homeric parallels of many of their names suggest their antiquity.¹⁵

97 Leurini does not inform us to whom Ion ascribed this allocation. However, most ancient sources make Teos' legendary founder Athamas¹⁶—a name that Ion lists as one of Oinopion's sons in the *Foundation* (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10). He may have claimed the founder of Teos as his countryman.¹⁷ The political ramifications of this are obvious. It is hard to say whether this represents a genuine Chian tradition or a deliberate act of appropriation. Athamas is an important and well-attested figure in the famous myth-cycle that culminates in the voyage of the *Argo*; he is the father of Phrixos and Helle. Since Hesiod, he is consistently said to be king of Orchomenos and son of the Boeotian Aeolus (not the god).¹⁸ In this light, a Chian claim to Athamas seems to be particularly brazen and spurious.¹⁹ However, this man is never connected to Teos (or Chios), so it is possible that they are, in fact, two separate figures. Pherecydes refers to both men but in different fragments that need not be associated.²⁰ Pausanias comments that "it is said" (*legetai*) that the Tean Athamas was descended from the Boeotian (7.3.6). This presumably represents local Tean tradition as Pausanias found it, though perhaps influenced by the historical rationalization that common names ought to be connected.

There is another source that confirms a Chian claim to Athamas but that, ironically, also affirms that he was actually identified with the Orchomenian. This is an inscription in Chios, dating to the second or

¹⁵ *CIG* 3064: see Hunt (1947); Huxley (1965) 36.

¹⁶ Anacreon fr. 142 Gentili; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F102; Strabo 14.1.3; Paus. 7.3.6; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Teos*; cf. *CIG* 3078, 3083. Another founder was Neleus, son of Codrus (Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F125; *Marm. Par. FGrH* 239 F27; cf. Paus. 7.3.6). Teos' inhabitants are often said to be of particularly mixed stock (Strabo 14.1.3; Paus. 7.3.6; cf. Hdt. 1.146), but were also invariably assumed to be Athenian-derived (Hdt. 1.142, 147, 2.178 with Hellanicus, *Marm. Par.*, Strabo, Paus., as above).

¹⁷ We need not be surprised that Pausanias failed to mention it in connection with Teos, as he usually prefers local authorities.

¹⁸ Hesiod fr. 10 M–W; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 FF98–101, FF103–104; Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F126; Eur. *TrGF* F929b; Ap. Rhod. 3.360; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.3; Paus. 1.44.7, 9.24.1, 9.34.6–8, cf. 7.3.6. Later sources make Athamas the son of Minyas and/or king of Thebes, Phthia or Thessaly. For these and details of his legends, see Roscher's *Lexikon* s.v.

¹⁹ Teos' ancient connection to central Greece is further suggested by her *purgoi*, many of which have names with epigraphic counterparts in Boeotia, Thessaly and Arcadia: Hunt (1947) 76.

²⁰ As Jacoby does. Pherecydes on the Boeotian: see note 18; on the Teian: *FGrH* 3 F102.

first century BC. It records the arrival of Oinopion from Crete and gives his family and followers: an Athamas is listed as one of his sons. Unlike Ion, the inscription also has a Cretheus as another son of Oinopion.²¹ Cretheus is otherwise invariably the son of Aeolus of Boeotia and brother of Athamas of Orchomenos.²² If the inscription's commissioners tried to reinforce a claim to Athamas by adopting his brother as well, then they also show who they really thought Athamas was.

It is not certain that there was a Chian attempt to assert an interest in Teos but 97 Leurini (= *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etym. Or.* s.v. *λόγχη*) and 98 Leurini (= *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10) of Ion's *Foundation* and the Hellenistic inscription seem to provide an intriguing instance of the 'kidnapping' of a mythological figure, comparable to Pherecydes' of Aias. The fact that Ion did not, as far as we know, claim Cretheus to be one of Oinopion's sons (98 Leurini) suggests either that he viewed his Athamas as genuinely distinct from the Orchomenian or that, unlike the commissioners of the inscription, he knew better than to overplay his hand at mythographic one-upmanship.²³

The Foundation of Chios (2): Delos and the Trojan War

Athenaeus, in a passage describing different ways of mixing wine, cites Ion's *Peri Chiou* (presumably the *Chiou Klisis*) as the source for some seer's prediction to Palamedes that the Greeks could sail if they drank their wine in a one-to-three mix with water instead of the usual two-to-five (99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e);²⁴ it is not clear what the advantage was. This Palamedes is the Greek hero at Troy, not mentioned by Homer but attested as early as the *Cypria*—famous for his technical

²¹ Contoléon (1949) 5, line 15.

²² Hom. *Od.* 11.237; Eur. *TrGF* F929b; Ap. Rhod. 3.358ff., etc. See Roscher's *Lexikon* s.v.

²³ Neither the fragment of Anacreon (ὅτι μή, Οἰνοπίων...) nor the scholiast who cites it—as evidence that Oinopion was Chios' founder and Dionysus and Ariadne's son (Schol. Aratus *Phaen.* 640 Martin)—give any reason to suppose that Oinopion was connected to Athamas or Chios to Teos, as Veneri (1977) 97–8 suggests.

²⁴ The fragment is corrupt, but I believe that my paraphrase gives the sense of it. For various proposed emendations, see Jacoby (on *FGrH* 392 F2) and Leurini's note. The emendation ὁ μάντις Παλαμήδης is unlikely, as the hero is nowhere else referred to as a seer.

innovations and his untimely end at the hands of Odysseus.²⁵ Other sources may enable us to understand better the fragment's context.

Non-Homeric accounts of the Trojan War include the story that, when the Greek army was delayed at Aulis, famine struck, and Palamedes was sent to Delos in order to fetch the Oinotrophoi.²⁶ These girls, "the wine-growers", Oino, Spermo and Elaia, Dionysus had blessed with the ability to procure wine, grain and oil magically. Their father was the founder and king of Delos, Anios, son and priest of Apollo. He possessed the gift of prophecy—in another version, the Greek expedition stopped at Delos *en route* to Troy and he predicted that the city would not fall until the tenth year, and invited the Greeks to stay with him in comfort until then.²⁷ This man could therefore be Ion's "seer", and the advice concerning sailing accords with the incident's usual context, after the assembly of the Greek army, but before its departure for Troy. Ion's interest in including this non-Homeric fairy-tale may relate to Anios' connection to Chios: he was the grandson of Staphylos, Oinopion's brother.²⁸ 99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e could represent a two-fold attempt to assert Chios' importance. First, it could remedy her unfortunate failure to contribute to the Trojan War. That Ion's solution involved a recommendation concerning the use of wine may not surprise us in view of the fame of Chios' product.²⁹ It is also charmingly trivial and may be indicative of a certain sense of

²⁵ See Roscher's *Lexikon* s.v.

²⁶ Schol. Lycoph. 581; cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 3.10; Dictys of Crete 1.23. Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 2.81 says that Odysseus' deadly jealousy of Palamedes came, in part, from the latter's success in finding provisions, which perhaps relates to these events. Other versions have the Oinotrophoi fetched by Menelaus and Odysseus (Simon. *ap.* Schol. Hom. *Od.* 6.164 = 537 *PMG*) or Agamemnon (Ov. *Met.* 13.632–74). In art, Menelaus is preferred: Trendall (1985). See Gantz (1993) 577–8 for all references.

²⁷ Lycoph. 569–83 with Schol. ad 570 (citing the *Cypria*, *EGF* fr. 19); Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F140.

²⁸ Diod. Sic. 5.62.1–2; Schol. Lycoph. 570; Huxley (1965) 37. Staphylos as Oinopion's brother: Plut. *Thes.* 20.2; Apollod. *Epit.* 1.9; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.997–1004a Wendel. Diodorus names a Cretan general, "Anion", as the founder of Delos in the same passage in which Rhadamanthys allocates Chios to Oinopion (5.79.2)—clearly a rationalized version of the same information.

²⁹ On the fame of Chios' wine see, for example, Barron (1986) 94–5. Ion's enthusiasm is attested by a number of anecdotes: for example, T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios; T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; T21ab, 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f (Baton of Sinope); Ael. *VH* 2.41; cf. 99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = Ath. 426e. This may be an inference by later writers due to his authorship of drinking songs. There is evidence for a tradition that directly connected Palamedes to Chios in the speech doubtfully attributed to the fourth century BC rhetorician Alcidas. The purported speaker (Odysseus) asserts that Palamedes

humour. Second, 99 Leurini may allude to the contemporary political situation, namely the existence of the Delian League. Chios had been an enthusiastic supporter of the establishment of the Athenian-headed alliance (Plut. *Arist.* 23.4–5); national pride may have encouraged Ion to highlight her link to the island. Unfortunately, it is impossible to connect 99 Leurini to any event in the history of the League.

Chios and Athens

The next of Ion's fragments, 96* Leurini = 29 West = *Thes.* 20.2, suggests a further political use of the medium of myth to describe his view of the relationship between Chios and Athens.³⁰ Athens had a long-standing claim to be the founder of the Ionian cities of Asia Minor, through migrations led by the sons of King Codrus, especially Neleus. This claim had currency outside Athens: both Athenians and Ionians exploited it with clear political objects, notably to drum up support for the Ionian Revolt and to sanction the foundation of the Delian League.³¹ However, though Chios was regarded as Ionian, most ancient writers, including Ion, agree that her legendary founder was not an Athenian but Oinopion, who came with a fleet of settlers from Crete.³² Physical evidence supports this tradition. The Hellenistic Chian inscription listing Oinopion with his family and followers has already been mentioned.

visited Oinopion at Chios when recruiting for the Greek army: *Odysseus: Against Palamedes for Treason* §20 Blass.

³⁰ My dependence in this section on other scholars—especially Jacoby (1947a) 4–7 and Barron (1986) 90–4—will be obvious.

³¹ Solon fr. 4a West; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F155; Hdt. 1.147; Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F48, F125; Eur. *Ion* 74–5, 1575–89; *Marm. Par.* *FGrH* 239 F27; Strabo 14.1.3; Paus. 7.2ff. The Ionian revolt: Hdt. 5.97. The Delian League: Thuc. 1.95.1, cf. Hdt. 9.106; Barron (1986) 90–1. In the mid-fifth century a *temenos* was dedicated to the sons of Ion as tribal *eponymoi*, either by the Athenians or the Samians: Barron (1964) especially pp. 46–8.

³² For example, 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8; Critias fr. 2 West; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F276; Diod. Sic. 5.79.1, 84.3. Jacoby (1947a) 5–6 suggests that Oinopion displaced “Melas” as founder. A Cretan foundation was not universally accepted: Hdt. 1.142, 146, 7.95, 9.106 and Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F125 seem to regard Chios as an Athenian settlement. Strabo states that they were Pelasgian (13.3.3) and elsewhere names an Egertios as the founder (14.1.3), an otherwise unknown figure, perhaps invented by some over-zealous Hellenistic mythographer: Jacoby (1947a) 6. It is possible that Strabo's source is Pherecydes: Strabo explicitly cites him at the beginning of his passage on Ionia (*FGrH* 3 F155), and *FGrH* 3 F102 is also consistent with Strabo's comments on Teos at the end. The background is supplied by Sakellariou (1958) s.v. Chios.

In addition, Pausanias reports that there was a tomb of Oinopion at Chios, probably the subject of another inscription, dating to the fifth century BC, that mentions an *[Oin]opioneion*.³³

As for Oinopion's ancestry, his connection to Dionysus is unsurprising in view of his name, which means "wine-drinker" or "wine-face"³⁴ (his brother's name, Staphylos, means "grape-bunch").³⁵ The ancient sources, starting with Hesiod, are uniform in making him the son of Dionysus and Ariadne.³⁶ Ion, however, differs on this point. His view in the *Foundation* does not survive, but Plutarch in his *Life of Theseus* cites his elegiac fragment (96* Leurini = 29 West = *Thes.* 20.2) as the authority for a version of Theseus' and Ariadne's relationship. He quotes Ion as saying in relation to Chios: τὴν ποτε Θησεΐδης ἔκτισεν Οἰνοπίων, "...this, once, Theseus' son Oinopion founded." This verse is the only evidence for a connection between Theseus and Oinopion.³⁷

It is possible that Oinopion's descent from Theseus represents a genuine, if obscure, tradition and therefore has no wider significance. As noted above, the verse fragment is a relative clause which implies that the comment was incidental and that Ion did not emphasize it and expected his audience to accept it (though not necessarily believe it) without further explanation. In addition, there is a vase by the Lewis Painter, Ion's near contemporary, which Jacoby cites to corroborate Oinopion's Thesean parentage. On one side, it shows Athena sending the victorious Theseus (labelled "...*SEUS*") on his way: he departs to the left while turning awkwardly to look over his shoulder, a spear in his left hand while his right is raised in farewell or submission. On the other side, a woman hands two boys over to a nymph (*NUPHE*). Jacoby suggests that the woman is Ariadne and the boys are Theseus'

³³ Tomb: Paus. 7.5.13. Inscriptions: Contoléon (1949) 9. There is also archaeological evidence for Minoan influence in Chios: Veneri (1977) 95.

³⁴ Contoléon (1949) 6n1.

³⁵ Staphylos is called Dionysus' son and Oinopion's brother by, for example, Apollod. *Epit.* 1.9; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.997–1004a Wendel. Cf. Satyr. *FGrH* 631 F1; Parth. *Amat. narr.* 1; Diod. Sic. 5.79.2; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.16; Plin. *NH* 7.56 (199); Plut. *Thes.* 20.2.

³⁶ Hesiod fr. 238 M–W; Anacreon 505e *PMG* (Schol. Aratus *Phaen.* 640 Martin); Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F276; Diod. Sic. 5.79.1; Apollod. *Epit.* 1.9; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.997–1004a Wendel. See Leurini's note on 96* Leurini. Exekias portrays Dionysus handing a vine to the youth Oinopion (the figures are labelled) on *ABV* 144.7, London B210.

³⁷ Plutarch's remark that Ion was only one of several writers to record this is possibly his own deduction: Jacoby (1947a) 5.

sons Oinopion and Staphylos.³⁸ However, even if the identification of the woman is correct,³⁹ that of the two boys is only guesswork. A scholiast on Homer provides an alternative, saying that Ariadne was the mother of Theseus' sons Demophon and Acamas.⁴⁰ In short, the Lewis Painter's vase does not corroborate any tradition that Ion's elegiac fragment may represent.

For that matter, 96* Leurini = 29 West = *Thes.* 20.2 can barely be reconciled even with other Chian accounts, as far as they are known. The fourth century historian Theopompus is orthodox in making Dionysus Oinopion's father.⁴¹ Zenis of Chios says that Minos gave Theseus his daughter Phaedra; that his work presumably recounted Chian traditions (it was called *Peri tes patridos*) is suggestive but not sufficient to connect Theseus to Chios.⁴² According to Strabo "the Chians" said that Pelasgians from Thessaly were their first settlers.⁴³ Moreover, there is little or no evidence that Theseus was represented in Ionia in either cult or myth.⁴⁴

In a sense it amounts to much the same thing, whether Theseus' relationship with Oinopion was an obscure tradition or Ion's own invention: it is the propagation of a certain arrangement of mythical data that, in view of its unconventionality, can hardly have been unintentional. 96* Leurini = 29 West = *Thes.* 20.2 is consistent with the desire, typical of at least some Ionians in the fifth century, for a link to Athens through some kind of foundation myth.⁴⁵ However, the appearance of Theseus is atypical in the Ionian tradition, which suggests that Ion's adoption of him was a conscious choice. Theseus is arguably a more distinguished figure than yet another of Codrus' rather characterless sons. By Ion's time, he was regarded as the founder, in some sense, of the Athenian state and was recognized throughout the Greek world not only as the author of heroic deeds, but as a champion of justice,⁴⁶

³⁸ *ARV*² 972.2, Vienna 1773; Jacoby (1947a) 7.

³⁹ Comparison with a vase by the Syleus Painter (c. 470 BC) with near-identical figures, but labelled, suggests that it is: *ARV*² 252.52, Berlin 2179; Neils (1987) 124–5.

⁴⁰ Ἀριάδνη Μίνωος θυγάτηρ, γυνὴ Θησέως, ἐξ ἧς Δημοφῶν καὶ Ἀκάμας; Schol. Hom. *Od.* 11.321; West (1985) 77n22.

⁴¹ See note 36.

⁴² Zenis *FGrH* 393 F1.

⁴³ See note 32.

⁴⁴ Barron (1986) 92–3; Walker (1995) 12–3.

⁴⁵ See note 31.

⁴⁶ Cf. Bacchyl. 17.20–46.

order⁴⁷ and patriotism of an increasingly panhellenic hue.⁴⁸ Ion's verse fragment suggests that this figure was being used as the vehicle for a more intimate relationship with Athens.

It might be said that, as a piece of Athenian imperialist propaganda, Ion's introduction of Theseus into Ionia was spectacularly unsuccessful. However, this is to mis-state the nature of the process. These media—the literary *Foundation* and the verse fragment—were likely intended for an élite of literati and symposiasts. The aim was to represent a notion to the approving few, not to disseminate it to the many, and win their approval.⁴⁹

Ion, Tydeus, Cimon and the Wine-Man

This may exhaust the possibilities available from Ion's own writings, but there is another item that shows the same method of mythological allusion. This time a link is made not between Chios and Athens but between a Chian and an Athenian—viz, Ion and Cimon.

Thucydides, in his account of the political struggles on Chios in 411 BC, records that the leader of the pro-Athenian party, suppressed by the Spartans, was one Tydeus, son of Ion.⁵⁰ It is not certain that this is our Ion, but it does seem likely in view of the prominence and strong connections with Athens that he and Tydeus evidently shared.⁵¹

⁴⁷ For example, Theseus' fight against the Centaurs on the West pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia is charged with a sense of conflict between order and chaos.

⁴⁸ Theseus appeared in person to help fight the Persians at Marathon, commemorated in the Painted Stoa: Paus. 1.15.4, cf. 10.10.1. Around the mid-fifth century, his battle against the Amazons was transformed from his own brigandage to an act of national defence: Aesch. *Eum.* 686; in Attic art from c. 450 BC: Walker (1995) 55, 65–6. Theseus as democrat and synoecist is not explicitly attested before the last quarter of the fifth century: for example, Eur. *Supp. passim*; Thuc. 2.15; Walker (1995) 143–69, 196–9, cf. 174–9.

⁴⁹ Cf. Ferretto (1985).

⁵⁰ T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3.

⁵¹ It is typical of Thucydides' method that he does not provide further information on Tydeus' father. Ion's father Orthomenes probably had Athenian connections as well. The suggestiveness of Ion's own name hardly needs comment. The youthful age at which he first gained entrance to Athenian society (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6) implies that he had some kind of introduction. Orthomenes' nickname "Xuthus", father of the legendary Ion, is a joke that probably came from Athenians who knew him and not just his son: T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios; T9a, 114 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion; see

Tydeus is a heroic name. Scholars, to date, have contented themselves with the observation that its appearances are rare, occasionally adding the thoughts that Ion was inspired by his poetic interests; implying that Aeschylus, whom he certainly knew,⁵² was an influence; or conjecturing the existence of a relationship with the Athenian general Lamachus, who also had a son Tydeus.⁵³ There has been no inquiry as to *why* the name might have appealed to Ion, despite acknowledgement of his interest in and exploitation of myth in other contexts.

The hero Tydeus is referred to frequently in the *Iliad* on account of his son Diomedes, but he is best known in his own right as one of the Seven Against Thebes, and is characterized by an exceptional enthusiasm for fighting.⁵⁴ Indeed, the name means “thumper”. As with other examples of mythological allusion, genealogy seems to provide the key to his meaning for Ion. The father of the mythical Tydeus was the king of Calydon in Aetolia, one Oeneus.⁵⁵ Putting aside Oeneus’ other connections,⁵⁶ this observation invites three particular associations.

First, we can observe that the name Oeneus means, of course, “wine-man”. It is on this account that he shares a number of features with the founder of Chios, Oinopion. Both are intimately associated with Dionysus. Oinopion is usually said to be his son: even if Ion preferred an alternative version, he cannot have been unaware of this well-attested tradition that goes back to Hesiod. Dionysus gave him the secret of wine-making.⁵⁷ Oeneus is never said to be descended from Dionysus, but the existence of some connection or substitution is suggested by a tradition concerning his daughter Deianira, that she was, in fact, Dionysus’

Jacoby (1947a) 1n9. See Blanshard in this volume on a Chian “Achilles”—another son of Ion? Incidentally, there is a fragmentary epigram on a third-second century BC stele from Chios: *πᾶσιν πάντα κριταῖ[ς]... | Ξούθου παῖς Χῖος το[...]* (154g*** Leurini = Chios Museum Inv. 677; see *SEG* 16.497; Trypanis 1960; Leurini 2000a *ad loc.*). We can only speculate who or what the “Chian child of Xuthus” might refer to.

⁵² 108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de; *Quomodo adul.* 29f.

⁵³ For example, Mattingly (1977) 238; Barron (1986) 101 and n66.

⁵⁴ For example, Hom. *Il.* 4.365–400, 5.800–13, 10.284–90. Post-Homeric sources sometimes emphasize the negative side of Tydeus’ aggressiveness (for example, Aesch. *Sept.* 364ff.; Eur. *Supp.* 901–8), including eating his enemies: see Beazley (1947).

⁵⁵ Svenbro (1993) discusses the psychology and anthropology of children’s names.

⁵⁶ Oeneus’ myths revolve around the tribulations of his family, such as the death of his son Meleager when his mother Althaea burned the faggot to which his life was tied; his daughter Deianira, wife and accidental murderess of Heracles; and his own overthrow by his brothers or nephews. See *RE* s.v. Oeneus.

⁵⁷ Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F276; Diod. Sic. 5.79.1; depicted in art as early as Exekias: *ABV* 144.7, London B210.

daughter, the product of adultery with Oeneus' wife Althaea.⁵⁸ Oeneus is also a recipient of the vine from Dionysus (sometimes in return for having turned a blind eye to Dionysus' affair with his wife).⁵⁹ A slightly different account is that the vine was found by a goat tended by Oeneus' herdsman, who was called Staphylos⁶⁰—the same name as Oinopion's brother. The figure Melas also connects Oinopion and Oeneus. The name features in Chios' early history, appearing twice in Ion's *Foundation*, once for the son or half-brother of the island's eponym, and then for one of Oinopion's sons.⁶¹ Chios is, in fact, referred to as "Melas' city" (*Melanos astu*) in a sixth century epigram.⁶² Melas is also Oeneus' brother.⁶³ Oeneus has another wine association in the incident in which Heracles accidentally kills his wine-pourer.⁶⁴ This incident barely fits into any narrative cycle and so is probably a genuine mythical datum. Whether the common features that make Oeneus a virtual *alter ego* of Oinopion arose from diffusion of one legend, or from the operation of similar structures of thought in different parts of Greece, is immaterial as regards any potential for allusive exploitation in classical times. In choosing the name Tydeus for his son, I suggest that Ion is alluding to himself: the "wine-man", he may have thought, was an appropriate appellation for Chios' best publicist.

Apart from the association of the name Oeneus with wine, the name has a second reference that Ion may have found appealing. The epic genealogist Asius of Samos—of unknown date but possibly quite early—records that Oeneus was grandfather to Samos, that island's eponym.⁶⁵ Ion may have invoked the name in order to suggest that Samos was, in some way, dependent on Chios. This is parallel to his apparent attempts to involve Chios in the mytho-historical foundations of Teos and Delos.

The third possible significance to arise from Ion's allusion to Oeneus is not the king of Calydon but his homonym, the local hero of Attica,

⁵⁸ Eur. *Cyc.* 38–9; Satyr. *FGrH* 631 F1; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.8.1; Hyg. *Fab.* 129. She is more usually said to be Oeneus' daughter: Hesiod fr. 25 M-W; Bacchyl. 5.165–73; Soph. *Trach. passim*, etc. Cf. Pozzi (1996).

⁵⁹ Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.8.1; Hyg. *Fab.* 129.

⁶⁰ Serv. ad Verg. *G.* 1.9.

⁶¹ 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8.

⁶² See Jacoby (1947a) 5.

⁶³ Hom. *Il.* 14.115–6. On their myths, see Gantz (1993) 168, 333–4.

⁶⁴ Archilochus fr. 286–288 West; Diod. Sic. 4.36.2; Paus. 2.13.8. For all these myths see *RE* s.v. Oeneus.

⁶⁵ Asios of Samos, *EGF* fr. 7.

eponym of one of the Cleisthenic tribes. Pausanias says that he was the illegitimate son of Pandion, but we are left groping for further details.⁶⁶ For a tribal eponym to lack heroic dynamism is not in itself surprising. Patriotic dignity and social utility were doubtless sufficient qualifications. The suitability of Oeneus' (presumable) associations with viticulture can be compared to Cecrops, with his innovations in writing and social practices, and Hippothoön, whose connection with Eleusis affords a probable link with agriculture.⁶⁷ The Attic Oeneus does seem, like his Calydonian namesake, to have some Dionysian connections. Demosthenes, in his funeral speech for the Battle of Chaeronea, ennumerates an exploit or quality for each eponymous hero in order that each of the ten tribes might have an edifying precedent for their valour. He says that the Oeneidae were particularly motivated to fight in a war that united Athens and Thebes, as Dionysus, Cadmus' grandson, was Oeneus' father (Dem. 60.30). Note that this statement also highlights the dearth of heroic legends concerning Oeneus. This may represent nothing more than a rhetorical fiction or a piece of folk-etymology, but this does not make it less meaningful as evidence for Greek mythic conceptualizations. The location of his cult centre is unknown, but the tribe Oeneis may have had a geographical association with the Theatre of Dionysus below the Acropolis, on account of the discovery of a list of the tribe's *prytaneis* for 360/59 BC near the Asklepieion.⁶⁸

Lastly, there may be a Dionysian connection in one of the few vases that features Oeneus.⁶⁹ This is a bell-krater by the Dinos Painter dating to the last quarter of the fifth century. It shows a bearded man (*AKAMAS*) and a woman watching a young man in armour (*PANDION*) pouring a libation. *OI[N]EUS* is on the right, a beardless young man wearing a wreath and holding two spears. He is clasping the hand of a girl (*CHOIROS*) in greeting or farewell.⁷⁰ Acamas and Pandion are tribal eponyms, so there is no ambiguity in Oeneus' identity. The bacchic link is provided by the name Choiros: this name is also given to a maenad on another vase by the same painter, depicted along with

⁶⁶ Paus. 1.5.2. See especially Kron (1976) 188–9.

⁶⁷ Kearns (1989) 89, cf. p. 87. Selection of the *eponymoi*: Hdt. 5.66; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.6.

⁶⁸ *IG* II² 1745; Harrison (1979) 77. Note her arguments against locating Oeneus' cult at Acharnae.

⁶⁹ Oeneus in art: Kron (1976) 189; Kearns (1989) 91.

⁷⁰ *ARV*² 1153.17, Syracuse 30747.

Dionysus and satyrs called Simos and Komos (“revel”).⁷¹ Choiros is not otherwise attested as a name. It is slang for—as Henderson puts it—the “youthful female member”.⁷² It is not far-fetched to see a bacchic theme in an image on a bell-krater that depicts the Athenian “wine-man” greeting a maenad called “virgin cunt”. There is one more vase that may be relevant. This has a dramatic depiction of an abduction. One of the assailants has the same features as the Dinos Painter’s Oeneus: a beardless young man with wreath and two spears who lays hands on a girl, although much more violently. These images may indicate that Oeneus was associated with abduction myths: perhaps he was not linked to a specific incident, but functioned within a *generally* representative iconography of sex and/or marriage.⁷³

Ion was not simply devoting his life to raking up a mammoth list of wine-allusions. His apparent interest in the Attic Oeneus is explainable by personal considerations concerning his relationship with the general Cimon, who belonged to the tribe Oeneis (Plut. *Cim.* 17.3). References to Athenian tribal heroes served political purposes from at least the mid-fifth century. On Samos, a *temenos* was dedicated to the Ionian tribal eponyms, and Euripides in the *Ion* forecast the destiny of Ion’s sons to found colonies.⁷⁴ These, of course, are pre-Cleisthenic tribes and refer to states, but to cite an individual’s tribe for the purpose of personal flattery is neither qualitatively different nor unprecedented. Bacchylides, Ion’s contemporary, refers to the athletic victory of one of his subjects “as bringing glory to the Oeneidae” (Bacchyl. 10.18).

At first sight, the suggestion that Ion’s naming of his son alludes to Cimon might seem to rest on a rather improbable chain of associations: Cimon’s tribal eponym evoked through a homonym of the father of Ion’s son’s mythical namesake. However, the allusion should not be seen as convoluted, but as subtle, and demanding that such cultivated wit be appreciated—a skill typical of the poetic and sympotic games of Ion’s and Cimon’s aristocratic milieu. Through his son’s name, Ion was able to embody, in a good-humoured fashion, Chios’ national emblem and

⁷¹ *ARI*² 1154.29, Naples 2369; Beazley (1939) 487.

⁷² Henderson (1991) 60 and 131 (no. 110).

⁷³ Schefold (1982) 236. I am reminded of Ion’s elegy that ends, “And whoever has a fair bedfellow awaiting him, let him drink more bravely than the rest”: 90.9–10 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac.

⁷⁴ See note 31.

also to pay tasteful homage to Cimon, his patron and representative of the best aspects of the Athenian commonwealth.

Conclusion

Ion's method of mythological allusion in regard to Cimon reflects in miniature, and on a personal level, what we have already seen on an international scale in the *Foundation of Chios* and the fragment of elegy. The *Foundation* evidently covered more ground than Pausanias' paraphrase implies. The fragment concerning the divisions of Teos (97 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F3 = *Etym. Or.* s.v. λόγχη) seems to refer to a foundation *by* Chios. The significance of the anecdote about Palamedes (99 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F2 = *Ath.* 426e) can only be guessed at, but if it concerns either a claim to Delos or to the Trojan War, it involves an assertion of Chian pride. That these remains all *could* have political ramifications may be an accident of preservation, and it is hard to gauge the seriousness of the spirit in which they were created, *but the political thread cannot be disregarded*. They indicate a concern to present Chios' claims in Ionia and the Aegean—for priority if not hegemony—and attest the existence of a competitive patriotism between neighbouring states, even among those who were on good terms.

Now that Ion's interest in novel re-arrangement of mythologies has been explored, is it possible to say *why*? 'Political interest' is a ready answer, but is almost too facile. An alternative explanation for Ion's preference for unusual versions of myths might be that they, in themselves, interested him. Unfortunately, barely enough of his output survives to enable judgements on this, and these fragments may not be representative of the whole. The quote from Plutarch's *Life of Theseus* is a case in point, preserved precisely because it contained unusual information. Political and parochial interests at least provide a thread through which Ion's work becomes more accessible to us. Parochial self-assertion can be an end in itself without implying the desire for fulfilment in political action. This attitude is entirely comprehensible in a state with significant power, but which perhaps had a nagging feeling of not being quite first-rank. Indeed, Ion's parochial pride may be less than perfectly serious. If nothing else, this provides an insight into the existence of rivalries within the Delian League and the form that they took. Such rivalries amuse us—they might have amused the protagonists as well.

CHAPTER EIGHT

TRAPPED BETWEEN ATHENS AND CHIOS: A RELATIONSHIP IN FRAGMENTS

ALASTAIR BLANSHARD

Introduction: The World of Ion

Subjects demand space. Existence requires one simultaneously to reflect, engage with, and deny one's environment. It is all too easy for historians of literary figures to focus on the first of these survival strategies—to imagine that the literary world and its fictional events enjoy an uncomplicated relationship with the world outside—than to appreciate other authorial gambits. Articles proclaiming the mimetic power of literature have proliferated in recent decades.¹ It is an approach that can unite even those who might otherwise disagree violently on methodology.² Although the origins of such work can be located in the German interest in *Weltanschauung*, it gets most of its intellectual meat from a diet of historicizing literary criticism that seeks to represent authors as merely products of their own cultural time and place.³ According to this view, an author and his works inevitably betray the embedded ideological and cultural structures of a society, and can be used to recover this material.

This may be true. Yet, the assumptions that underpin this approach have been undergoing serious critique in recent years, and perhaps invite revision of our faith in such approaches. Whatever model we postulate, it seems that the relationship between text and reality is never going to be simple. The first assumption that one might question is the monolithic and stable notion of society that is required for this approach to work. In order for this to be a valid method of historical

¹ See, for example, Millar (1981); Scarcella (1977); Veyne (1961); Williams (2002).

² Compare, for example, Millar (1981) with Hopkins (1993). On the methodological disagreements between these scholars, see Hopkins (1978).

³ In this respect, the influence of Morris (1964) has been particularly influential. See Millar (1981) n59.

investigation, ideological structures need to be embedded so deeply, and their influence so pervasive, that their effect cannot be escaped. Moreover, these structures need to be so resistant to change that their truths remain applicable across time and space—far beyond the text in which they operate. The second aspect that is open to question is the assumed passivity of the author who becomes a cipher, an automaton for the transmission of values.

However, if, as many recent commentators have argued, culture turns out to be more dynamic and less stable than previously thought, then we are well advised to re-think our approaches to historicizing literature.⁴ In particular, once we begin to see cultural norms as friable and contingent, then new opportunities for thinking about literary products become available. We might start to downgrade their mimetic importance and begin to see ways in which they constitute claims by agents operating in a maelstrom of competing and complementary forces.

In this chapter, I want to see how such an approach might be useful for thinking about the work of Ion of Chios. In particular, I want to focus not on how his work describes the world, but how it reacts to it. I want to examine the methods by which Ion is able to establish a way of being. Ion provides perhaps one of the earliest test cases for such an approach. He exists at the beginning of history in two senses. First, he belongs to the generation of writers whom we might regard as the founders of history. Whatever precursors we postulate for his *Chiou Ktisis* (*Founding of Chios*) and *Epidemiai* (*Visits*), it is clear that Ion's works represent a radically new way of discussing and conceiving the past. His choice of medium (prose rather than poetry), his discussion of contemporary and near contemporary events, and his love of physiognomic and biographical detail all presage elements crucial to the ancient genre of *historia*.

Secondly, in the period in which he lives, the narrative about Greek history changes. The early archaic period is largely a period without actors. It is best discussed in terms of macro-trends of trade, population, migration and expansion. It is a world of communities, peoples and cultures. Reliance on the literary record is undertaken at one's peril.⁵ Ion and his generation introduce a world in which we can begin

⁴ For the volatility of culture and its contests within this period, see Dougherty and Kurke (2003b) 1–16 (with bibliography).

⁵ On the unreliability of the literary record, especially in relation to individuals, see recently Morris (2003).

to perceive a sophisticated notion of agency. The world of Ion is one that invites us to write a different kind of history.

It is, of course, no accident that these two features coincide. The second proceeds from the first. Ion's historiography ensures his historicity. This paper wishes to explore this combination of historiography and historicity by running the life and works of Ion against the cultural forces operational in his period. By resisting the tendency of classical historiography to eschew the structural in favour of the biographical, this paper hopes to gain a new understanding of Ion and his work. It attempts to locate this work within a network of social, political and economic forces. Ion's life and work become part of a conversation between an individual and his environment. Ion is (or rather, makes himself) emblematic of the series of negotiations that all individuals must make. In his resistance to dominant trends, he confounds crude notions of inter-state relations. In the congruence of his actions with lines of power, he complicates notions of agency.

In order to understand this personal politics of Ion, we need to reconstruct the vectors that buffeted him. Such reconstruction is difficult and can only be conducted in relatively crude terms. Yet such reconstruction is preferable to the vacuum into which Ion might otherwise be consigned. Without wider context, we miss the way in which Ion establishes himself as a player in the culture games of the fifth century. For example, we need context to see that his poetic description of the change in the number of strings on the lyre (93 Leurini = 32 West) is not a piece of musicological antiquarianism, but a calculated gambit that places him in the centre of a raging debate about the role and status of *mousike* in the classical city.⁶ At the same time, it should also make us suspicious about his status as a disinterested observer. Ion may claim this status for himself, but we should be reluctant to believe it. Disinterest is a strategic pose, part defensive, part offensive. Similarly, in Ion's works, absence speaks as loudly as presence. He lived through a period of rising imperialism, democratic radicalization, economic transformation, and the constant recalibration of Athenian-Chian relations. We should pay careful attention to the scars he chooses to show, and those he leaves covered.

This chapter concludes that one of the important operational factors in Ion's writing was his status as a Chian foreigner who was implicated

⁶ For this debate, see Wilson (2003); Csapo (2004); and Power in this volume.

in the cultural life of a hegemonic power. This relationship was far from easy. It created tensions that needed to be displaced and defused. In his writings, Ion establishes a form of resistive accommodation. Through recourse to the panhellenic elite practice of the symposium, he is able to carve out for himself a place that allows him space to criticize in safety (as Katsaros also discusses in this volume). However, it is a space that always threatens to collapse—not only because Ion's art of dissimulation threatens to break down, but also because of the city's suspicions about sympotic practice. Ion's world turns out to be a floating one.

A Special Relationship? Athens and Chios in the Fifth Century

Ion of Chios. What hangs on an ethnic? What hangs on *this* ethnic? Thinking about Ion as *Chian* prompts a series of questions. What distance does it set up from Athens? How does Ion negotiate the imperial tensions that run through Athenian *arche*? How does he negotiate his outsider status in writing about Athens, and how does this problematize the status of such writings? Central to answering these questions is an exploration of contemporary materials and the conversations conducted around them.

Let us begin by examining the inter-state relations between Athens and Chios during Ion's life. After all, Ion's particular investment in this relationship would eventually cost the life of his son—murdered in 411 by pro-Spartan oligarchs for perpetuating his father's politics:⁷

οἱ δὲ Χῖοι ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις πεπληγμένοι, καὶ ἄλλως ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς οὐ πᾶν εὖ διακείμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μετὰ Τυδέως τοῦ Ἰωνος ἤδη ὑπὸ Πεδαρίτου ἐπ' ἀττικισμῷ τεθνεώτων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης πόλεως κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐς ὀλίγους κατεχομένης ὑπόπτως διακείμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἡσύχαζον . . .

The Chians had been knocked about by many battles before, and were certainly not united amongst themselves. And with Tydeus, son of Ion, and his followers having been killed on a charge of Atticism, the rest of the city was repressed by the oligarchs, suspicious of one another, and exhausted . . .

(T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3)

⁷ For the generally accepted suggestion that Tydeus is the son of Ion the poet, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1880) 13n14. For discussion, see Jacoby (1947a) 1n9.

As Tydeus' blood runs down the page of Thucydides' narrative, we may wonder just how unmarked Ion's pro-Athenian politics were. Although our knowledge of Chian history and internal politics is far from complete, there is every reason to suspect that attitudes towards Athens were a divisive issue—one of the fault lines that ran through Chian society—and that scholars have mistakenly down-played the tensions in this relationship.⁸ The lack of open rebellion by Chios until 412, and its status as a ship-contributing state, have often misled scholars into believing that her relationship with Athens was unproblematic and popular.⁹

In fact, the strongest evidence so far produced for a 'special relationship' rests on a joke. It is found in a difficult exchange in *Birds*. At the City Dionysia in Spring 414, Aristophanes teamed up with Callistratus to produce *Birds*, and along the way re-think comedy's relationship with fantasy.¹⁰ Midway through the play, the audience encounters the first of a series of stock Athenian characters, the long-winded priest who offers prayers and sacrifice for the founding of the new city-state of *Nephelokokkygia* ("Clouducuckooland").¹¹ In the course of an elaborate parody of contemporary religious practice, the priest requests the Gods to:

ΙΕΡΕΥΣ: διδόναι Νεφέλοκοκκυγιεῦσιν
 ὑγίειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν
 αὐτοῖσι καὶ Χίοισι

Priest: Give to the citizens of Clouducuckooland health and security both for themselves and the Chians.
 (Ar. *Birds* 877–79)

To which Peisetairos adds:

Χίοισιν ἥσθην πανταχοῦ προσκειμένους.

I like this practice of always adding the Chians.
 (Ar. *Birds* 880)

⁸ Scholars have been keener to recognize the divisive nature of politics at the time of the anti-Athenian revolt: see Bruce (1964) 273–7; Meiggs (1972) 359–63.

⁹ For the ridiculousness of distinguishing between ship and cash-contributing states when considering imperial repression, see Finley (1978) 109–10.

¹⁰ On the peculiar nature of this comedy, and the consequent problems of its interpretation, see Dunbar (1995) 2–5; MacDowell (1995) 221–8; Murray (1933) 135–63; Sommerstein (1987) 1–4; Vickers (1997) 154–5; Whitman (1964) 167–72; Zimmermann (1983) 66–72.

¹¹ On the figures as "stock", see MacDowell (1995) 209: "a cavalcade of typical Athenian characters".

It is a joke that prompts the scholiast to write an inter-state history:

ἤρχοντο γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι κοινῇ ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ Χίοις, ἐπειδὴ ἔπεμπον οἱ Χῖοι συμμάχους εἰς Ἀθήνας, ὅτε χρεία πολέμου προσῆν, καθάπερ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ ιβ' τῶν Φιλιππικῶν φησιν οὕτως· οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τοῦ ταῦτα πράττειν ἀπείχον, ὥστε τὰς εὐχὰς κοινὰς καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐποιοῦντο, καὶ σπένδοντες ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς δημοτελέσιν ὁμοίως ἤρχοντο τοῖς θεοῖς Χίοις διδόναι τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς . . . τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς Θεοπόμπου καὶ Θρασύμαχός φησιν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ τέχνῃ. ὁ δὲ Ὑπερίδης ἐν τῷ Χιακῷ καὶ ὅτι Χῖοι ἤρχοντο Ἀθηναίοις δεδήλωκεν.

Indeed, the Athenians used to pray both for themselves and the Chians at their festivals because the Chians sent forces to assist Athens when the demands of war required it, just as Theopompus says in book 12 of his *Philippica* [FGH 115 F104]: “But many resisted carrying out such actions so that they made common prayers both for those men as well as themselves, and pouring libations in their public sacrifices, they likewise prayed to the Gods to give good things both to the Chians and themselves” . . . And Thrasymachus says the same things as Theopompus in the *Megale Technē* [85B3 DK]. And Hyperides in the *Chiakos* [fr. 194 Jensen] shows that the Chians pray for the Athenians. (Schol. Ar. *Birds* 880 Holwerda)

From this dense collection of fragments, the Scholiast would like us to conclude that the prayers of Cloudcuckooland imitate the prayers of Athens. Certainly the metrical looseness of the lines (highlighted by the ‘mock-solemn’ strophes that frame them) sends us in the direction of the prosaic.¹² We are asked to believe that, at some point in the second half of the fifth century, it became common practice in Athens to include special mention of Chios in civic prayers and sacrifices. Indeed, it was a practice of such ubiquity that its presence not only prompts wry recognition in the audience, but also helps confirm Cloudcuckooland’s status as an ‘other Athens’. If this were the case, then such a state of affairs would have important implications for our understanding of the status of Chios in the Athenian empire and her relations with Athens. Chios would be elevated to a position of almost unique closeness to Athens.¹³

However, as scholars have pointed out, there is much that seems to argue against this scholiast’s interpretation. Theopompus F104 is most

¹² For metrical analysis of this passage, see Parker (1997) 322–3.

¹³ The only parallel would be the status of the democratic exiles of Samos whose loyalty to Athens was recognized in *IG* I³ 127.

likely an extension of F103, and as both fragments come from book 12 of the *Philippica*, a book that is generally concerned with the events of 391–374 (the career of Evagoras of Cyprus), it seems likely that the alliance between Athens and Chios, to which the fragment refers, is the one formed in 384/3.¹⁴ Presumably, it is this alliance to which the other fragments refer, and their sentiments are more suitable to the period surrounding the formation of the Second Athenian Confederacy.¹⁵ Furthermore, as Barron points out, the joke is not necessarily about the closeness of Athens and Chios: it may instead refer to her estrangement from her allies. Normally, Athens would pray for herself and her allies; but in 411, with widespread rebellion in the Empire, and Chios, the sole significant ally still loyal, it may have seemed to Athens that only Chios was left to add to the end of every prayer and sacrifice.¹⁶

Indeed, Thucydides was frank about the pragmatism that underpinned Chios' dealings with Athens. Discussing the events surrounding the Chian revolt in 412, he writes:

Χῖοι γὰρ μόνοι μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίους ὧν ἐγὼ ἡσθόμην ἠὲ δαιμόνησάν τε ἅμα καὶ ἐσωφρόνησαν, καὶ ὅσῳ ἐπεδίδου ἡ πόλις αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον, τόσῳ δὲ καὶ ἐκοσμοῦντο ἐχυρώτερον. καὶ οὐδ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀπόστασιν, εἰ τοῦτο δοκοῦσι παρὰ τὸ ἀσφαλέστερον πράττειν, πρότερον ἐτόλμησαν ποιήσασθαι ἢ μετὰ πολλῶν τε καὶ ἀγαθῶν ξυμμάχων ἔμελλον ξυγκινδυνεύσειν καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡσθάνοντο οὐδ' αὐτοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἔτι μετὰ τὴν Σικελικὴν ξυμφορὰν ὡς οὐ πᾶν πόνηρα σφῶν τὰ πράγματα εἴη.

Indeed, the Chians, after the Spartans, are the only people I know of who have kept their heads in prosperity and who, as their city increased in power, increased also their own measures for its security. One may think that this revolt was an example of over-confidence, but they never ventured upon it until they had many good allies ready to share the risk with them and until they saw that, after the Sicilian disaster, not even the Athenians themselves were any longer pretending that their affairs were not in a really desperate state.

(Thuc. 8.24.4–5, tr. Warner)

¹⁴ Shrimpton (1991) 55.

¹⁵ Indeed, it is perhaps not surprising that the extraordinary provisions of the Constitution of the Second Athenian Confederacy over the importance of autonomy, the rejection of cleruchies, and absence of tribute seem to be the product of negotiations with the Chians. See *IG* II² 43 with Cawkwell (1973) 50–1.

¹⁶ For this interpretation of the joke, see Barron (1986) 102–3.

The implication here is striking. Chios remains loyal only while Athens is powerful. As the Mytilenean ambassador to Sparta warned in 427, one should be wary of reading Lesbian and Chian passivity as support for the Athenian regime.¹⁷ A desire to channel profits into means of defence does not suggest a city at ease with its position. In Thucydides, security (τὸ ἐχυρόν) is normally a concern of those under immediate threat, whether it is Greeks facing the Persian menace (1.90), or Athenians being harried by Syracusan forces (7.77). The moment an opportunity presents itself, Chios loses no time in attacking. Indeed, the anti-Athenian feeling of the Chian oligarchs becomes all the more important if we assume that they belong to roughly the same group that has held power in Chios for most of the fifth century.

The precise form of government that operated in Chios for the period of Ion's life remains unclear. It has been variously characterized as oligarchic, democratic and even a mixture of both.¹⁸ The most likely solution seems to involve the presence of a weak popular assembly with most decisions being made by a council and a number of boards of magistrates; perhaps, a limited democracy with power largely exercised by local élites. This situation is evidenced in archaic Chian law, and the extant fifth-century inscriptional evidence supports such a view.¹⁹ However, whatever form of government was in power, it was inevitable that its interests and the interests of the Athenian state would come into conflict. Moreover, as Athens rose in power it could only encroach upon its Ionian ally.

It is not hard to find moments of tension between Athens and Chios throughout the period of Ion's life. The period of his birth coincides with political instability on the island as two factions wrestled for control.²⁰ It was a battle that reflected sharp differences in outlook. While the ruling faction that underpinned the tyranny of Strattis looked to Persia, his opponents consistently looked westwards for help.²¹ This

¹⁷ See Thuc. 3.9–14, especially 12: οἱ μὲν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ δεδιότες ἐθεράπευον, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐκείνους ἐν τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐποιούμεεν... δέει τε τὸ πλεόν ἢ φιλίᾳ κατεχόμενοι ξυμμαχοὶ ἦμεν, "And they were considerate, fearing us during war-time, and we acted in a similar way towards them during peace... we were allies held together more by fear than by friendship".

¹⁸ For discussion of the evidence, see Quinn (1969) and O'Neil (1978–79).

¹⁹ For the early Chian law, see Jeffery (1956). Discussion of the inscriptional evidence is given in O'Neil (1978–79) 70.

²⁰ For the date of Ion's birth as 480 or a little earlier, see Jacoby (1947a) 2n7.

²¹ For the interconnection between Persia and the tyranny on Chios, see Hdt. 4.138. For discussion of the political circumstances on Chios in this period, see Hardwick (1991) 91; Yalouris (1976) 140–2; Wade-Gery (1958) 19.

opposition culminated in an unsuccessful coup in approximately 480, with the ringleaders fleeing to the Hellenic League to seek military assistance in overthrowing Strattis.²² Although initially reluctant to accede to this request, Greek forces did eventually effect the deposition of Strattis after the battle of Mycale (Hdt. 9.105). Given that the relationship between Cimon and Ion's father must date from this period, we have every reason to suspect that Ion's family was associated with the anti-Strattis faction.²³ From the very beginning, then, Ion's association with Athens takes on a political character. He is the poet son of a regime change.

Such factionalism is also a healthy reminder of the fiction involved in talking about 'Chian attitudes'. In a large and complex society, the range of responses to any issue will be multitudinous. We can only talk meaningfully about Chian and Athenian relations in the grossest sense. It is more profitable to chart the issues for discussion, and delimit some of the ways in which that discussion might take place. Given the imperializing trend of Athenian rule throughout the fifth century, it is inevitable that we are not short of such issues. Whatever the (range of) attitudes that Chians held at the time of the formation of the Delian League—and we have no reason to doubt that the attitude was reasonably positive—it was not too long before the pressures of Athenian hegemony began to be felt. For example, we find the legal jurisdiction of Chios impinged upon from as early as the 470s, only a few years before Ion's arrival in Athens, a fact illustrated by the Phaselis decree:

ὅ τι ἄμ' μὲ[v] 'Αθ-
 [ήνησι ξ]υ[μβ]όλαιον γένηται
 [πρὸς Φ]ασηλιτ[ῶ]ν τινα, 'Αθή[v]η-
 [σι τὰς δ]ίκας γίγνεσθαι παρ-
 [ὰ τῶι πο]λεμάρχῳ, καθάπερ Χ-
 [ίοις, καὶ] ἄλλοθι μηδὲ ἄμῳ.

Whenever a legal action arises in Athens involving a Phaselite, the case at Athens shall be heard in the court of the Polemarch and nowhere else, just as is the case with the Chians.

(IG I³ 10 ll. 6–11)²⁴

²² For this coup, see Hdt. 8.132.

²³ In this respect, see the suggestion of Mattingly (1977) 236 that Ion was named in a flush of Ionian patriotism and anti-Persian feeling at the start of the second Ionian revolt.

²⁴ The bibliography on this clause and its interpretation is voluminous: see Wade-Gery (1958) 180–200; de Ste Croix (1961) 100–12; Meiggs and Lewis (1988) 66–9; Todd (1993) 332.

Chios had been responsible for enrolling Phaselis into the Delian League (Plut. *Cim.* 12.3–4), and so it is appropriate that they suffer the same legal regime. The decree is based on a pre-existing arrangement involving legal disputes arising in Athens between Athenians and Chians. These arrangements provided that such disputes would only be held at Athens, and only in the court of the Polemarch. Although such arrangements were presumably a privilege designed to facilitate trade between the two states, they soon became the source of tension. It was too easy to represent them as the extension of Athenian *arche*.²⁵ One of the characteristics of empire is the assumption of control in the regularization of trade.²⁶ Moreover, this intervention in the conduct of Chian commerce forms a precursor to the more blatant imperialism of the Athenian decree on coins, weights and measures which caused the cessation of the production of Chian coinage in the 420s. In these decrees we see that the gloves are off.²⁷

Traces of Chian dissatisfaction with Athenian hegemony are not hard to find. The so-called “Spartan War Fund” records the following donation:

ἔδ[ον] τοὶ φεύγοντες τῶν Χίων τοὶ φίλοι τοὶ τῶν
[Λακεδαι]μονίων χελίος στατῆρας Αἰγιναίος.

The Chian exiles, who are friends of the Lacedaemonians, gave one thousand Aeginetan staters.

(IG V 1,1 ll. 9–10)

The precise date of the donation is debatable. A date around 427, the same time as Ion was competing in the City Dionysia, seems preferable.²⁸ However, this is only the terminus for a sequence of events that must start much earlier. We need to envisage the formation of a pro-Spartan faction and a range of actions that had eventually led to exile. The precise date for establishment of this faction remains uncertain. However, there is some suggestion that the Spartan War Fund only records one of a series of donations which may have been sent regularly for some time.²⁹

²⁵ So most famously in [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.16. For discussion of this passage, see Frisch (1942) 223–7. For this misrepresentation of Athenian intentions, see Thuc. 1.71.1, 76–7.

²⁶ See Finley (1978) 107–8.

²⁷ For the break in production at Chios, see Hardwick (1993) 216.

²⁸ See Loomis (1992) 56–76.

²⁹ See Loomis (1992) 79n131.

The pressures caused by Athenian rule and Chian dissent meant that relations between these two states needed to be continually monitored and re-negotiated. It is these tensions which, perhaps, bring another son of Ion into our documentary record. Thucydides records that Athenian distrust of Chios had reached such a height in 425 that Athens demanded the Chians demolish their walls in case of rebellion (Thuc. 4.51). If the parallel of Mytilene provides any guide, failure of the Chians to comply would have resulted in an immediate declaration of war.³⁰ In the end, Chios capitulated in return for Athenian promises (*pisteis*) not to violate the existing constitution. It seems an unequal bargain. Chios gave up its means of resistance in exchange for mere words.

Part of those words survive in an inscription found in the Athenian Agora which recorded the decree resulting from the Athenian and Chian negotiations.³¹ Most of the decree is lost and the surviving fragments are primarily concerned with an amendment to the decree proposed by the prominent politician Cleonymus. Nevertheless, some interesting features emerge from these fragments. The Chian negotiations seem to have been conducted by two prominent Chians, Philip and Achilles.³² As Barron (1986: 101–2) has pointed out, it is tempting to believe that this Achilles may be one of Ion's sons, a brother to Tydeus. Certainly the heroic name points in this direction, and the Athenian connections of the family would make him an ideal candidate to conduct negotiations.³³ Even if we discount this possibility, one does not relish the position of these two members of the Chian élite. The position in which they found themselves was a tricky one. The Athenian demands were harsh and uncompromising. Even the decree providing the negotiated security reflects this imperial tone. Not only does it seem likely that the burden for the erection of the decree fell to the Chians, but the penalty for violation of the decree was death and confiscation of property.³⁴ Chian resentment is easy to imagine. Cleonymus certainly envisaged potential reprisals, inserting a protection clause in his amendment which made

³⁰ See Thuc. 3.2–3.

³¹ *IG I³* 70. The inscription is published and discussed in Meritt (1945) 115–9, no. 10; cf. *SEG X*, no. 76.

³² Only the name Philip is secure. Achilles is the most likely reconstruction for the name of the other negotiator. For arguments in favour of this name, see Barron (1986) 101–2 and Meritt (1945) 116.

³³ On the symbolism of Ion's choice of Tydeus for the name of his son, see Olding in this volume.

³⁴ On the erection of the inscription, see Meritt (1945) 118.

the ambassadors and their sons inviolate (lines 4–6). Philip and Achilles, then, found themselves facing the problem which all members of the élite in allied states faced: namely, that while their status made them implicit in any negotiations, they needed to manage their complicity in the resulting arrangements. Such was life under Athenian rule.

These tensions also play out in the cultural sphere. The comic stage plays home to those groups that make Athens anxious. It is not surprising then, that along with women, slaves and politicians, we find Chians—a group who, like their fellow Ionians, enjoyed a reputation for their love of luxury and effeminacy.³⁵ This feature is most strikingly observed in Aristophanes' *Triphales* where a group of whining, lisping Ionians harass a character to sell a boy in their hometown:

ἔπειθ' ὅσοι παρήσαν ἐπίσημοι ξένοι
 ἐπηκολούθουν κήντιβόλουν προσκείμενοι,
 'ὅκως ἔχων τὸν παῖδα πωλήσει 'ς Χίον',
 ἕτερος δ' 'ὅκως ἐς Κλαζομενάς', ἕτερος δ' 'ὅκως εἰς
 Ἐφεσον', ὁ δ' 'ἐς Ἀβυδον'.

Then as many foreign big-shots as were present hung round him imploring; one cried, "Since you have the boy sell him in Chios"; another, "sell him in Clazomenae"; while still another, "in Ephesus", and another, "in Abydos".

(Ar. *Triphales* F556 PCG)

Like the fictional subject of this fragment, Ion and his fellow Chians must have found it difficult to escape the clutches of these "Stage Ionians".³⁶ Even within supposedly complimentary fragments, uncomfortable politics still lurk. So, for example, the fragment of Eupolis' *Poleis*, which is normally cited to show Athenian admiration for Chios, reads:

αὕτη Χίος καλὴ πόλις.
 πέμπει γὰρ ὑμῖν ναῦς μακρὰς ἄνδρας θ', ὅταν δεήσῃ
 καὶ τᾶλλα πειθαρχεί καλῶς, ἅπληκτος ὥσπερ ἵππος

³⁵ So, for example, Schol. Ar. *Peace* 171 explains a reference to Chian incontinence with the explanation "that the stretched arses of the Chians are due to their effeminacy" (ὡς Χίων διὰ μαλακίαν εὐρυπρώκτων ὄντων). One might also note the relish with which Eupolis in the *Philoï* (F296 PCG) recounts the story about the Chians whose love of slavery causes them to be sold as slaves themselves.

³⁶ It is also worth noting Meineke's emendation of ἐπιδημοι for ἐπίσημοι in the first line of the fragment—an emendation which just ties it closer to Ion, the man whose own self-presentation casts himself as the perpetual visitor.

This Chios is a fine city. It sends us many ships and men whenever there is need, and is also extremely obedient, just like a horse that needs no whipping.

(Eupolis *Poleis* F246 *PCG*)

It is hard not to feel the imperial arrogance that commodifies a city like this—thinking the greatest praise that can be offered is comparison with an already-tamed horse! It is the very opposite of the dramatization by Cimon (which supposedly impressed Ion) of Athens and Sparta as potentially ill-matched “yoke-fellows” (107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = Plut. *Cim.* 16.8–10).³⁷ Indeed, on the subject of comedy, it is perhaps worth observing that Aristophanes’ *Peace* not only functions as Ion’s obituary (T7, 84 Leurini = 745 *PMG* = Ar. *Peace* 835–37), but also jokingly recalls the imperial repression by Athens of Chios. Mounted on his dung-beetle, Trygaeus warns the audience not to fart lest the smell of excrement distract the beetle and he fall to his death:

...ὥς ἤν τι πεσὼν
ἐνθένδε πάθω, τοῦμοῦ θανάτου
πέντε τάλανθ’ ἡ πόλις ἡ Χίων
διὰ τὸν σὸν πρωκτὸν ὀφλήσει.

Because if I fall from here and suffer any harm, my death will cost the city of Chios five talents all because of your arsehole.

(Ar. *Peace* 169–72)

Chios will pay for Trygaeus’ death because this is the price that Athens exacts for the assassination of one of its citizens. Within the Athenian *arche*, it became standard policy to hold city-states collectively responsible for the deaths of Athenian citizens in their territory. Normally, states were required to pay the sum of five talents as compensation.³⁸ It goes without saying that there were no reciprocal arrangements in the event of the murder of a foreigner on Athenian soil. The reference to Chios is presumably a topical reference to the extortion of just such a payment from the island. Indeed, the joke that, no matter what the circumstances, Chios will be found responsible, may refer to the fact that Athens was not particularly scrupulous in treating its ally with justice. Certainly, the scholiast to these lines thought so.

³⁷ For this phrase in Plutarch, see Pelling in this volume.

³⁸ For example, see *IG* I³ 19. For discussion of this practice, and this passage of Aristophanes, see Meiggs (1949). For a similar imperial pronouncement forbidding allies to insult Athenian magistrates or deface Athenian stelai, see the discussion in Balcer (1976) 262–6.

Potent History:
The Search for Agency in the Chiou Ktisis and the Epidemiai

All this evidence, I suggest, serves to problematize Chian identity within Athens. Being Chian was something that all Chians needed to come to terms with in their cohabitation with Athens. It is a shame that we are unable to determine the size of the resident Chian population in Athens in the fifth century. We have only a smattering of names in our epigraphic sources, although the number and pattern of dispersal of names suggests that the Chian population was roughly of the same magnitude as other Ionian states such as Samos and Lesbos, but less than communities such as Plataea.³⁹

However, some individual case-studies are illuminating. I will offer one as illustrative of issues of Chian self-identity and performance. It is the grave of Hephaistes of Chios found in the Kerameikos. Grave-finds date it no later than the death of Ion, and possibly to a decade earlier.⁴⁰ The grave consists of a small, decorated marker with the name and ethnic of the deceased carved at its head. Beneath the marker the cremated remains of the deceased were placed in a red-figure *pelike* by the Peleus painter. On one side, Achilles is shown receiving his armour; a youth and boy are depicted on the other.⁴¹ What is interesting is the way in which the grave manages to amalgamate aspects of Attic and Chian identity. This form of slab stele is typically Attic.⁴² However, it is a choice that is in keeping with the aesthetic of low-set block monuments that are distinctive to Chios and the surrounding areas.⁴³ More notable is the inscription,

ΗΦΑΙΣΤΗΣ
 ΧΙΟΣ
 (IG I³ 1335)

Here, the unusual name, the use of Ionic script, and the presence of the ethnic all indicate the deceased's Chian origins. This burial is a clever amalgam of aspects of Chian and Attic influences to produce a

³⁹ For listings of foreigners in Athens, see Osborne and Byrne (1996).

⁴⁰ For report and description of the grave, see Amandry (1947–48) 389.

⁴¹ For attribution and bibliography, see *ARV*² 1040.14 (Athens 15299).

⁴² See Boardman and Kurtz (1971) 123.

⁴³ For discussion of these monuments, see Boardman and Kurtz (1971) 235–7 and Contoléon (1947–48) 275–6. Indeed, the painted decoration on the stele (Amandry 1947–48: 389) is also in keeping with an East Greek aesthetic.

product that functions on Attic soil, but does not hide its Chian roots. It is a way of being Chian in Athens. It is this sort of negotiation that I wish to examine in the work of Ion. Empires do not just produce compliance or rebellion—more often they elicit arrangements of convenience, a *modus vivendi*. How did Ion get by?

The authorial choices that Ion made in his work on “the founding of Chios” (*Chiou Ktisis*) are illustrative of the types of negotiations and compromises that must be made as one negotiates a path through the conflicting pressures of competing inter-state identities. The subject matter is striking. Although there exist earlier poetic models, Ion’s work seems to be the first to tackle the subject in prose.⁴⁴ It certainly seems to have stimulated Hellanicus to produce a rival version (*FGrH* 4 F71).⁴⁵ Moreover, we can see such interest in local history writing as part of the changing face of *polis* culture. As the *polis* rises in prominence, so it appropriates and transforms the cultural forms previously associated with élites. Thus the genealogical histories of individuals written in verse give way to genealogical histories of communities written in prose.⁴⁶ This genre was competitive. Within communities, authors competed to determine who knew a state best; and amongst communities, the competitive production of rival histories was a source of *polis* pride. In this context, we should properly see Ion’s *Ktisis* as a spur and rival to the tradition of Athenian Atthidography. Certainly, works of this sort commanded enough respect to have irritated Thucydides (cf. 1.21.1).

One obvious example of the significant choices that an author like Ion must make is choice of dialect. Language choice is one of the most important markers of identity.⁴⁷ In this respect, one fragment from the *Ktisis* enjoys special prominence. It is found in the lexical gloss for the word λόγχα:

⁴⁴ On this work as a prose work, see von Blumenthal (1939) 17–8; Jacoby (1947a) 4–5; Dover (1986) 32. For an alternate view, see Cerri (1977). For the cultural significance of the “turn to prose”, see Goldhill (2002b), especially pp. 1–9.

⁴⁵ For discussion of this work, see Pearson (1939) 197.

⁴⁶ In this respect, it is worth noting the interest in genealogy expressed in the mid-fifth century Chian inscription for Heropythos which traces back his lineage fourteen generations. For text and discussion, see Wade-Gery (1952) 8–9.

⁴⁷ Crystal (2000) 40. For discussion of the importance of language choice as an expression of identity, see Adams (2003) 751–3; Adams and Swain (2002) 10–6; Langslow (2002) 39–41.

λόγχη· λόγχας τὰς μερίδας Ἴωνες λέγουσιν. Ἴων ἐν Χίου κτίσει· ἐκ τῆς
Τέω λόγχης λόγχας ποιεῖ πεντήκοντα. εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὴν λῆξιν, λάχην
τινὰ οὖσαν.

(97 Leurini = FGrH 392 F3 = *Ehym. Or.* s.v. λόγχη)

As the lexicographers could not help but notice, this is a passage that is as much about language as it is about Chian history. In the space of nine words, we are treated to three different terms for “an allotment”. The first is Ion’s usage, λόγχη. To underline its peculiarity, we are treated to two glosses, the first in Attic (λῆξις), the second in a more common Ionic form (λάχη < λάξις). There is every reason to believe that λόγχη is a peculiarly Chian form. One of its few attestations is found in a fourth-century Chian inscription (*SIG* 1013.12). Just like his compatriot Hephaistes, Ion is using language as an ethnic marker to underline difference. In this entry’s interplay of dialect forms, we are reminded that reading Ion’s *Ktisis* is an exercise in insider/outsider knowledge. Every raised eyebrow just confirms distance; every nod of recognition just brings you closer to Chios. In placing himself as an interpreter of Chian history, Ion locates himself at the point where insider and outsider meet.

Ion’s use of Chian dialect here is marked. He flirts with dialect. The experience that he offers is foreignness-lite, a pre-packaged experience for mass cultural tourism. So foreign place names (such as Mount Pelinnaion, with its unusual double nasal) are included while less exotic Chian dialect forms are eschewed.⁴⁸ Ion seems to be playing a sophisticated game with his Chian identity. He is commodifying it to make it digestible to Athenian power. He is a Chian tease. At the same time, he offers a subtle critique of Athenian ideology. It is Ion-the-traveller/visitor who is required to make things explicable. As Athens recreates itself as a centre, its margins become more remote. Stick to Attic and

⁴⁸ Πελινναῖον: 128** Leurini = Ael. *HA* 16.39 [= FGrH 395 F1]. On the double nasal as an Aeolic feature found in Chian names, see Buck (1955) 143. A further example may be found in the fragment of the *Ktisis* contained in Athenaeus (99 Leurini = FGrH 392 F2 = Ath. 426e): περὶ δὲ ταύτης κράσεως Ἴων ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν τῷ περὶ Χίου φησὶν ὅτι εὐρὼν ὁ μάντις Παλαμήδην ἐμαντεύσατο πλοῦν ἔσσεσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι πίνουσιν τρεῖς πρὸς ἓνα κύαθους, “About this mixture, the poet Ion in his work on Chios says: ‘The seer Palamedes foretold that the Greeks would have a speedy voyage if they drank three cups to one’”. Assuming the fragment is a *verbatim* quotation and has not been subject to editorial revision (on textual difficulties see Leurini *ad loc.*), it is noticeable that Ion uses πίνουσιν where the alternate Chian form πίνοισιν might stand. For discussion of Chian dialect characteristics in third person plurals, see Buck (1955) 143.

you will find yourself stumbling. Like every guidebook, the *Klisis* only takes you so far. Indeed, it is only when you throw away the guidebook that you can claim to be a native. Reading the *Klisis* catches you at a moment of ignorance.

These games of explication are played out not only in the realm of language, but also in the area of substance. Even from the corrupted summary offered by Pausanias of part of the contents of the *Klisis*, it is clear that Chios is a very different place from Athens (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10). Pausanias' claim that Ion "gives no reason why the Chians are classed with Ionians" (οὐ μέντοι ἐκεῖνό γε εἶρηκε καθ' ἣντινα αἰτίαν Χῖοι τελοῦσιν ἐς Ἴωνα—7.4.10) is an understatement. Ion's history is typified by successive waves of immigration. Ion's Chios really belongs nowhere, it is a mongrel place. Poseidon begins the wave of arrivals and he is soon followed by more permanent settlers from Crete, Caria and Euboea, especially Histiaea. Indeed, the decision to join the Panionion—to become Ionian—is only taken at a very late stage in Chian history. In this respect, the myth-history that Ion wishes to give to Chios is the very opposite of Athenian myth-history which prized autochthony above everything else.⁴⁹ In contrast to the city that increasingly became exclusory during Ion's lifetime—Ion's dramatic debut coincides with the passing of Pericles' citizenship law—we find a city that cannot help but be inclusive. It shares history—unlike Athens which steals it.

The only significant exclusion is Athens. The tradition of Athens as the mother of the twelve Ionian cities seems to have no place in Ion's history.⁵⁰ Instead, Ion wishes to calibrate the relationship of Athens with Chios through the figure of Oinopion. Pausanias only briefly mentions Oinopion. Yet, if Ion's *Klisis* is consistent with his elegies, then it seems very likely that he made Oinopion a son of Theseus.⁵¹ As Jacoby (1947a: 4–7) rightly observed, the discussion of the genealogy of Oinopion must be an important barometer of how Chios saw itself in relation to Athens. Although we cannot prove that Ion was the originator of the tradition, he is clearly one of its earliest and most important

⁴⁹ On the centrality of autochthony, see Loraux (2000).

⁵⁰ Jacoby (1947a) 6. The promotion of this tradition may have been contemporary with Ion's *Klisis*: see Jacoby (1949) 222–3.

⁵¹ 96* Leurini = 29 West = Plut. *Thes.* 20.2.

promoters.⁵² In linking this important figure from Chian myth-history to Athens, Ion is making an important political statement.⁵³

It would be a mistake to suppose that one reason could ever offer a complete explanation for Ion's choice in favouring this tradition, but I would like to explore some of the possible thinking that his decision facilitates. Ion's decision prevents the history of Chios being written as a narrative of colonization. Oinopion came from Crete, not Athens. He bore with him the shame of a mother abandoned, not the sense of obligations owed by a daughter-city to her mother. Moreover, he offers another way of unifying the two city-states—the sympotic. It is wine—Oinopion's gift to Chios and the commodity which became a signifier of the island—that will join the two states together.

Ion's privileging of the symposium is masterful. Within the safety of panhellenic elite practice, Ion gains a vantage point to observe the operation of Athenian hegemony.⁵⁴ Ion locates himself in one of the few institutions in which native and foreigner can meet and their differences can be elided through shared sympotic practice. It is a place where ties of *xenia* trump the competing claims of empire. So it is not Athens' wealth or power that bring Ion to Attica, but instead an invitation to dinner.⁵⁵ One of the observable features of the fragments of the *Epidemiai* is the structuring role of the symposium. It is no accident that the second longest fragment begins with *συνδειπνήσαι*⁵⁶ or that the longest fragment takes us to a dinner party within a sentence.⁵⁷ Ion has deliberately cast his encounters with Athens as sympotic adventures.

Consider the discussion of beauty conducted by Sophocles on his visit to Chios in 441/0 (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). Sophocles is shown as a wit, able to squelch other interlocutors, especially a visitor from Erythrai, all the while planning to make his move on the attractive youth who was pouring his wine.⁵⁸ The licence implicit in sympotic space empowers Ion; it allows him to pass judgements:

⁵² For discussion of this point, see Jacoby (1947a) 6–7.

⁵³ On the importance of Oinopion, see Forrest (1960a) 189.

⁵⁴ For this panhellenic, elite colouring, see also Ion's encounter with Aeschylus at the Isthmian games: 108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de; *Quomodo adul.* 29f.

⁵⁵ For the notion of imperial power reflected in the notion of Athens as destination, see Dougherty (2003).

⁵⁶ 106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6.

⁵⁷ 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d.

⁵⁸ The text is undecided about the origins of Sophocles' interlocutor. It records that he is either from Eretria or Erythrai. Erythrai might be preferred on the grounds of

τοιαῦτα πολλὰ δεξιῶς ἔλεγέν τε καὶ ἔπρησεν ὅτε πίνοι ἢ πράσσοι. τὰ μέντοι πολιτικά οὔτε σοφὸς οὔτε ῥεκτήριος ἦν, ἀλλ' ὥς ἂν τις εἰς τῶν χρηστῶν Ἀθηναίων.

Many such things he cleverly said and did whenever he drank or did anything. However, in political matters he was neither wise nor hard-working, but just another one of the Athenian élite.

(104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d [604d])

It also provides a place in which to observe the Empire. In Ion's symposia, imperial politics are never far away:

Σοφοκλεῖ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐν Χίῳ συνήντησα ὅτε ἔπλει εἰς Λέσβον στρατηγός, ἀνδρὶ παιδιώδει παρ' οἶνον καὶ δεξιῷ.

I encountered Sophocles the poet on Chios when he was a general sailing to Lesbos; a man playful at wine and clever.

(104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d [603f])

Ion does not let us forget that his meeting with Sophocles is not accidental. Sophocles has come to Chios on a mission to crush rebellion and enforce Athenian hegemony. While Sophocles' arrival heralds gaiety and amusement for his guests on Chios, for the Samians it will mean bloodshed, destruction and humiliation.⁵⁹ It is an operation for which Athens will enlist Chios and Lesbos as her lackeys.⁶⁰ Hector instituted Chios as a member of the Panionion. It took Athens to oversee the dissolution of Ionic unity. Sophocles is this war's culture hero.⁶¹ Ion describes in detail Sophocles' humiliation of the serving boy which climaxes in Sophocles' forcing himself upon the boy to the braying laughter of the crowd. In Ion's account, this act is not driven exclusively by *eros*, but also by a desire for Sophocles to show that he is able "to play the general" (στρατηγεῖν: 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d [604d]). Athenian politics is being played out on

proximity. There is a certain poetic logic in having this representative from Erythrai crushed by an Athenian general, just as his city was crushed by an Athenian general a decade earlier. For the campaign against Erythrai, see Meiggs and Lewis (1988) 91–3.

⁵⁹ For discussion of the Samian campaign, see Thuc. 1.116–7. On the tradition of brutality on this campaign, see Pelling in this volume.

⁶⁰ Both members send contingents of ships. However, their subordinate position in this campaign is illustrated by the fact that neither receives booty or indemnities in return for this service: Finley (1978) 114.

⁶¹ Sophocles' activities on this campaign seem to have attracted anecdotal attention. See, for example, the story of his extortion of money from the people of Samos: Schol. Ar. *Peace* 697.

the body of the Chian youth. It is an unpleasant scene. Ion spells out what it costs to join in with the laughter.

Similarly, in his account of his dinner with Cimon, Ion allows us to overhear the unpleasantness of the empire from the comfort of the *kline*. As guests relax, wine circulates, songs are sung and stories told. Cimon boasts about his cleverest gambit as a general. He recalls the time that he swindled his Ionian allies (amongst them, Chians) out of an equal share of the booty from their campaign at Sestos and Byzantium (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6). What truth wine brings out (εἰκὸς ἐν πότῳ: *Cim.* 9.2). It is significant that the stratagem that Cimon cites as his shrewdest is not a trick against his enemies, but his Ionian allies. He fools them into taking the lesser share of the booty by dressing it up as the greater. Athens profits at their expense. This is no gentle teasing.⁶² Cimon's fame blinds him to the μεῖράκιον in the corner taking notes—a subject who might laugh *differently* to everyone else in the room.

The symposium is Ion's compromise with the world around him. It has its advantages. As the exchange between Sophocles and his interlocutor demonstrates, it is a world that privileges *paideia* above every other consideration.⁶³ Where else can an Erythraian take on an Athenian general? Certainly not on the battlefield. It is the economy of the symposium that allows Ion to enter the orbit of Spartan royalty.⁶⁴ Its elegies allow him to rival Pericles in the affections of the Corinthian courtesan Chrysis (94 Leurini = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41). Yet, as his rivalry with Pericles in the affairs of the heart demonstrates, this sympotic mask comes at a price. It allows him to play politics, but only through a form of dissimulation. His work becomes a *roman à clef* in which the key is Chian identity. It is a compromise that forces him to take some strange bedfellows. His investment in the symposium binds him to Cimon, whose politics are the politics of the symposium. This is the feature which distinguished Cimon from other democrats such as Themistocles. Trust Ion to be alarmed by Themistocles' claim that he cannot sing, but he can run a good city: ἐκεῖνον γὰρ ᾄδειν μὲν οὐ φάναι μαθεῖν οὐδὲ κιθαρίζειν, πόλιν δὲ ποιῆσαι μεγάλην καὶ πλουσίαν

⁶² Contra Huxley (1965) 30.

⁶³ On *paideia* in the symposium, see Rösler (1995) 109.

⁶⁴ For the fragments of Ion's drinking song for the Spartan king, see 90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c. For discussion, see Jacoby (1947a) 7–9; Huxley (1965) 31–3; and Katsaros in this volume.

ἐπίστασθαι (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6 [9.1]). Such a politician is his worst nightmare. Without the benefits provided by the symposium, Ion is bereft and voiceless; a foreigner with nowhere to go. His hostility to Pericles, famed for shunning conviviality, was inevitable.⁶⁵ The radically democratic city was always suspicious of the symposium and its privileging of *xenia*. Perhaps, as Ion's subtle jibes demonstrate, rightfully so.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ For Pericles' hostility to the symposium, see Plut. *Per.* 7.5–6 and Geddes in this volume.

⁶⁶ On the democratic suspicion of the symposium, see Kurke (1999) 17–8; Murray (1990b).

PART THREE

ION THE POET

CHAPTER NINE

ION OF CHIOS AND THE POLITICS OF *POLYCHORDIA*

TIMOTHY POWER

Introduction

In the intensely politicized musical culture of Classical Athens, where few aspects of the production or consumption of *mousike* were ideologically neutral or purely aesthetic, the musical instrument, the *organon*, always occupies a most critical position; it is the material object, visually symbolic, around which the changing socio-political dramas of musical experience can be scripted. As musicologist Kevin Dawe has put it, musical instruments are “part of active and potent symbol systems. They exist in webs of culture, entangled in a range of discourses and political intrigues, and they occupy engendered and status defining positions”.¹ This assertion is meant as a wake-up call to collectors and curators—who typically fetishize instruments as purely aesthetic *objets d’art* or antique mechanical curiosities—and to contemporary musicology, until fairly recently an insistently ‘apolitical’ discipline, based in great measure on Romantic notions of music as a socially autonomous art, that has long neglected (or resisted) serious consideration of the sociology of instruments.² But no-one familiar with the representation of musical instruments in fifth and fourth century Athenian art and literature will be surprised by Dawe’s contentions; certainly, no-one who has read Peter Wilson’s rich studies of the manifold webs of culture in which the *aulos* and the *lyra* are entangled in Athens, of the wide-ranging ideological projects and social strategies in which these ‘simple’ reed and stringed instruments are put to deliberate use by Athenian poets, musicians, politicians and intellectuals.³ Wilson has shown definitively

¹ Dawe (2001) 221.

² This has been changing with some rapidity, however. See especially McClary (1991), Leppert (1993) and Waksman (1999), an important study of the electric guitar in twentieth century American popular culture.

³ Wilson (1999), (2004a); cf. also Martin (2003) and Csapo (2004) on the *aulos*.

the extent to which *organa*, always exceeding their materiality, constitute dynamic, contested complexes of ‘extra-musical’ ideas about cultural power, social formation, political order and identity.

In this chapter I would like to consider a short poetic text that raises a number of intriguing questions about the changing social significance of the lyre in the later fifth century. We owe its preservation to the second century AD music theorist Cleonides. In his *Introduction to Harmonics*, Cleonides undertakes a survey of the semantics of the word *tonos*. Arguing that *tonos* can be used in the sense of *phthongos* “musical note” (like that produced by a plucked string), he cites these elegiac couplets attributed to an “Ion” (93 Leurini = 32 West = Cleonid. *Isag. harm.* 12, p. 202 Jan = Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius *Harmonica* p. 116 Jonker):

ένδεκάχορδε λύρα, δεκαβάμονα τάξιν ἔχουσα⁴
καὶ⁵ συμφωνούσας ἀρμονίας τριόδους·
πρὶν μὲν σ' ἐπτάτονον ψάλλον διὰ τέσσαρα πάντες
Ἕλληνες, σπανίαν μοῦσαν ἀειράμενοι.

Eleven-stringed lyre, having a ten-step arrangement
and concordant road-junctures of attunement:
previously all Greeks plucked you at seven notes,
through (two) tetrachords, raising a poor music/Muse.⁶

Probably the beginning of a poem that would have continued for at least one more couplet,⁷ these lines have received a fair amount of scholarly attention over the past century, much of it focused on two problems. First, the question of authenticity and authorship—is Cleonides’ “Ion” Ion of Chios? Wilamowitz-Moellendorff thought that the eleven-stringed lyre celebrated in the poem was only invented (by the Milesian citharode Timotheus) long after the Chian’s death c. 422 BC. Accordingly, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff denied Ion’s authorship, putting forward another candidate instead, the fourth century Ion of Samos, an obscure composer of epigrams. However, these arguments have been satisfactorily refuted, and it is now generally agreed that “Ion” is the famed Ion of Chios.⁸

⁴ ἔχοις ἀεὶ fere codd.: ἔχουσα Meibom, ἔχοις Diels.

⁵ τὰς συμφ. codd.: καὶ West.

⁶ The translation is much indebted to the commentary of West (1992c) 23–8. On the Atticisms, see West (1974) 174.

⁷ A (*nun*) *de* clause must have answered the *prin men* in line 3.

⁸ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1903) 75n1; (1927) 283 (cf. Diels on 36B5 DK [= 93 Leurini = 32 West], p. 381). Refutation: Duse (1980) 122–3; West (1974) 173–4; (1992c) 23–4. I return to the dating of the invention of the hendecachord lyre below.

A second and more complicated problem has long challenged students of ancient organology and music theory: making sense of the complex description of the eleven-stringed lyre. What does Ion mean by “ten-step arrangement” and “concordant road-junctures of attunement”? A number of interpretations have been put forward, far too technically detailed to rehearse here. A reductive précis mainly derived from the analysis of M. L. West might run as follows: the eleven strings of Ion’s lyre—or more probably, as West notes, the *kithara*, the larger version of the tortoise-shell lyre—are ordered or arranged (*taxis*) so as to produce ten intervals or “steps” between each string’s note (*dekabamon*) which define a wide melodic compass.⁹ Whereas the arrangement of strings on the older heptachord lyre offers only two conjoined tetrachords (*tessara*)—that is, four tones that share one tone in common (for example, *efgabcd*, where *a* is the common tone)—the new hendecachord lyre features a disjunct tetrachord above or below two conjunct ones (for example, *efgabcd e’f’g’a’*). *a* and *e’* in the previous example are Ion’s *triadoi*, junctures where the player can take a new melodic “road”, seamlessly modulating into a different modal scale (*harmonia*). These road-juncture tones stand neatly in the “concordant” intervallic relation of an octave to other notes above or below: *e-e’*, *a-a’*.¹⁰ This amounts to saying that the hendecachord lyre offers its player complex harmonic and melodic possibilities that the (relatively) impoverished heptachord version cannot accommodate.

It is not at all my intention, however, to elaborate further the technical reconstruction of Ion’s hendecachord lyre. Rather, instead of continuing

⁹ *Lyra* is the unmarked term for any type of lyre, including the *kithara*, in fifth century poetry; the strict application of the terms does not come about until the fourth century (for example, Aristoxenus fr. 102 Wehrli).

¹⁰ West (1974) 174. West (1992c) 23–28 provides a far more rigorous analysis of the terminology. Cf. also Levin (1961), Comotti (1972), Duse (1980), and the earlier scholarship cited in West (1992c) 25n37. These accounts differ on some key technical points, but such details have no bearing on this chapter. Two recent works have offered more idiosyncratic readings of 93 Leurini = 32 West, neither persuasive. Maas and Snyder (1989) 154 suggest that Ion is describing a harp, not a polychord lyre, a contention solidly refuted by West (1992c) 24. Anderson (1994) 109–11 points out that *chorde* can mean “note” as well as “string” (which indeed it can, as when applied to the *aulos*: for example, Pind. *Pyth.* 12.19), and raises the possibility that Ion is referring not to a new eleven-stringed lyre, but to the seven-stringed instrument played with a technique that produces four extra notes in the form of harmonics. *Hendekachordos* would mean simply “producing eleven notes”. But given the historical reality of eleven-stringed lyres in the fifth century—a reality recognized by Anderson—this interpretation is forced and highly unlikely.

to treat 93 Leurini = 32 West as a free-floating chunk of music theory, as (seemingly) socially abstracted as the scientific discourse of Cleonides that frames it, I shall try to make sociological sense of it in relation to the frame from which it emerged, the Athenian ‘culture of strings’. I suggest that Ion’s positive appraisal of the hendecachord lyre, along with his criticism of the *spania mousa* of the heptachord lyre, is a coded ‘metamusical’ performance of socio-political subjectivity that goes well beyond the mere statement of aesthetic preference and technical/theoretical knowledge. That this elegiac poem was most likely composed for performance in the Athenian symposium, where such gestures of discursive and musical self-fashioning were taking new forms in the later fifth century, compels such a reading all the more.

Ion Mousikos at the Symposium

The greater part of extant archaic and classical elegy was composed for performance at symposia;¹¹ a sympotic context for 93 Leurini = 32 West makes sense on the level of general content as well as metre. *Mousike* was a defining element of the sympotic experience; sympotic elegy is thus full of references to the instruments that provide the soundtrack for drinking parties.¹² 93 Leurini = 32 West may be understood as an elaborate example of this tendency, but one very much in line with the increasingly elaborate metasymphotic language of the fifth century elegiac ‘renewal’: the complexity of the instrument and the theoretically rich underpinnings of the music it produces are matched by the complexity of the language.¹³ And it likely shows as well the influence of sympotic lyric, in which the motif of addressing the lyre or *barbitos* in song seems not to have been uncommon. The apostrophe to the *barbitos* with a *heptatonos garus* (“voice of seven notes”) that opens Bacchylides’ sympotic encomium for Alexander of Macedonia could have

¹¹ See, for example, Reitzenstein (1893) 45–52, West (1974) 11–12; Miralles (1971).

¹² For example, Theog. 241, 522–3, 761, 825, 941, 943, 1041, 1056. Cf. Ion’s reference to sympotic music-making in 90 Leurini = 27.7–8 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c: ἵτω διὰ νυκτὸς αἰοιδῇ, | ὀρχεῖσθω τις (“let someone dance and sing all night”). At 89 Leurini = 26.11 West = Ath. 447d, *choroi* (“choirs”) are called the “dear children” of wine. This is a reference, though, not to sympotic music, but to Dionysian festival choruses, probably dithyrambic—a genre in which Ion also worked.

¹³ See Miralles (1971), (1993).

been a specific point of reference (or foil) for Ion: ὦ βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάσ[σων] | ἐπτάτονον λ[ι]γυρὰν κάππαυε γάρυον· | δεῦρ' ἐς ἐμὰς χέρας ("O *barbitos*, guard no longer your peg and silence your sweet voice of seven notes; come to my hands . . .").¹⁴ Given the conservative, markedly amateur nature of music-making at the symposium indicated by most of our ancient sources, how can we explain the encomium of this new, technically sophisticated instrument, the eleven-stringed lyre? To answer the question we must try to understand something about the ideology of music, in particular lyre music, at the elite symposium, and the challenges to that ideology that were emerging in the second part of the fifth century.

I begin with one of Ion's own anecdotes that involves the symposium, the lyre and the assertion of elite distinction: the three elements central to my discussion of 93 *Leurini* = 32 *West*. In the *Epidemiai*, Ion describes how, as a young man, he witnessed Cimon distinguishing himself at an Athenian symposium by performing "not unpleasantly" a song he was called upon to sing and (presumably) play on the lyre (παρακληθέντος ῥῆσαι καὶ ᾄσαντος οὐκ ἠηδῶς, "having been called to sing, and having sung rather well").¹⁵ The other guests praise the aristocratic general for being "more sophisticated than Themistocles, for he [Themistocles] declared that he did not learn to sing or play the lyre, but knew how to make a city powerful and wealthy" (ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς παρόντας ὡς δεξιώτερον Θεμιστοκλέους· ἐκείνον γὰρ ᾄδειν μὲν οὐ φάναι μαθεῖν οὐδὲ κιθαρίζειν, πόλιν δὲ ποιῆσαι μεγάλην καὶ πλουσίαν ἐπίστασθαι).

The anecdote is valuable in that it neatly reveals a traditional conception of sympotic musical practice, in particular lyre-playing (*kitharizein*),¹⁶

¹⁴ Bacchyl. 20B Maehler; cf. Bacchyl. 20C 1–2 Maehler; Sappho fr. 118. The hymnic invocation of the *phorminx* in Pind. *Pyth.* 1.1–4 could be another (non-sympotic) lyric point of reference. It is tempting to make a connection between 93 *Leurini* = 32 *West* and 'Terpander' fr. 4 Bergk/Gostoli, two hexameter lines that herald the use of the seven-stringed, rather than the older four-stringed *phorminx* in the performance of a citharodic hymn to Apollo. But the authenticity of the latter fragment within the archaic 'Terpandrian' citharodic tradition, with which Ion would have been familiar, is in doubt. See, for example, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1903) 64n1, who dates the hexameters to the third century BC.

¹⁵ 106* *Leurini* = *FGH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6.

¹⁶ The importance of the lyre to sympotic musical culture is reflected in the central place of the *kitharistes* in the curriculum of primary education in Athens. On the ideological and practical continuum between the schoolroom and symposium see Reitzenstein (1893) 32–3. See Nagy (1990a) 107 with reference to the relation between these two elite institutions explored in *Clouds*; also Lissarrague (1990) 138–9.

that is central to the symposium's ideology of exclusivity: lyre-playing is an index of socio-cultural distinction, an expression of élite cultural *paideia* and gentlemanly sophistication (*dexiotes*); it is precious cultural capital that, in the private realm of the symposium, is valued more highly than the practical political know-how of the populist Themistocles, whose *amousia* marks him as a sympotic outsider.¹⁷ The lyre—both the music it produces and the politically fraught metamusical discourse it inspires—defines the exclusive aristocratic group. The Cimonian élites reassure themselves of their own pre-eminent distinction by critically qualifying Themistocles' political power in the democratic city with aspersions about his bad lyric culture.¹⁸

Ion, as his own aristocratic background and high-status *philiae* would suggest,¹⁹ is not a detached 'reporter' of the attitudes of aristocratic Athenian symposiasts; he shares them, and he partakes of the exclusive ideology behind them. Thus we hear Ion again praising Cimon's character in terms that recall his sympotic musicality, his "harmonious temper (*emmeles*) . . . and cultivated (*memousomenon*) performance in good society (*sumperiphorais*)", while damning, in comparison, a later populist politician, Pericles, in terms of his unsophisticated sympotic behaviour.²⁰ Ion calls Pericles' conversation (*homilia*) "impudent" (*mothonikos*), thus wittily giving a rather 'Laconic' colour to his cultural snobbery that certainly resonates with the Spartan-friendly politics of the Cimonian set. Elsewhere, Ion recalls with admiration Cimon's successful appeal in 463 BC to the Athenian *demos* to send Sparta a force of hoplites during the Messenian revolts (107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = Plut.

¹⁷ For the *amousia* of Themistocles see also Plut. *Them.* 2.4.2–5; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.4 (where it is noted, *summam eruditionem Graeci sitam censebant in nervorum uocumque cantibus*, "The Greeks held that the proof of the highest education was found in instrumental and vocal music"; tr. King). Cleon is unsurprisingly derided as a bad lyre player by the chorus of old school élites in *Knights* 989–90.

¹⁸ The élite rhetorical strategy is, of course, expertly turned round by Themistocles, who implies that it is just his lyric *amousia* that guarantees his political expertise in the democratic polis. See Wilson (2004a) 299–300. Wilson notes the anti-élite political significance of traditions connecting Themistocles to the construction of the first Athenian public music hall, the Odeion (Vitr. *De arch.* 5.9.1), a building devoted to the democratization of once élite-only lyric culture. Cf. Mosconi (2000) 250–70.

¹⁹ Jacoby (1947a), West (1985).

²⁰ 109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = Plut. *Per.* 5.3. See Ford (2002) 194, whose paraphrase I quote. Ford offers an excellent discussion of Ion's guardedly élite vision of the literary and musical "sophistication" (*dexiotes*) demonstrated by symposiasts (pp. 188–94). Sophocles famously won Ion's approval in this regard (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d); Ion connects the tragedian's *dexiotes* with his high social status (he is "one of the *chrestoi*") and his quietism in Athenian (democratic) politics.

Cim. 16.8–10); the elegiac 90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c has been read as Ion's own poetic contribution to this expedition.²¹ His characterization of Pericles as a *mothōn*—a Helot with airs—thus seems especially loaded.

Mothōnikos may carry with it an additional charge of élite-focalized musico-political criticism. The *Mothōn* was the name of a dance tune played on the *aulos* (Ath. 618c), an instrument that by the second half of the fifth century was increasingly being demonized by some discriminating élites as low class, morally debased, overly 'democratized', educationally and sympotically inappropriate—in large part due to its use by foreign professionals in the demotic entertainments of drama and dithyramb that bloomed in Periclean Athens.²² Furthermore, the dance performed to this piped tune is described as φορτικὸν ὄρχημα, καὶ νῆυτικόν, a vulgar, unrestrained dance, associated with sailors, those upstart promoters of radical democracy and cultural degeneracy in Athens, at least in the eyes of the culturally and politically conservative upper classes.²³ Ion figures Pericles' very speech as an inappropriate incursion of a low, deformed demotic culture of *mousike* into the high culture *kosmos* of the symposium—embodied in the graceful, politically correct figure of Cimon *mousikos*.

²¹ Jacoby (1947a) 9. Cf. West (1985) 74, who connects the poem to Cimon's later embassy to Sparta, around 450.

²² See Wilson (1999), Csapo (2004). Critias significantly marks the *aulos* as a distinctly unsympotic instrument in comparison to the stringed *barbitos*, which he associates with his aristocratic sympotic exemplar Anacreon (88B1.4 DK = 1.4 West); cf. Wilson (2003) 190–1. Note that, like Ion, Critias also composed 'public' aulodic music (for tragedy) and, like another famous rejecter of the *aulos*, Alcibiades, enjoyed playing it himself (Chamaeleon of Heraclea *ap.* Ath. 184d); there clearly develops in the fifth century a double standard about what is appropriate musical practice where and for whom: élites can both denigrate and play the *aulos*, but always on their own terms; it is a sign of their own mastery of the cultural discourse that they can create the rules under which such behaviours are not 'inconsistent'.

²³ The *Mothōn*: Pollux 4.101; cf. *Eq.* 697, Schol. Ar. *Pl.* 279, with Barker (1984) 275n74. On the powerful democratic ideology of the Athenian navy see Loraux (1986) 161ff., Euben (1997) 66, 89–90. Two later fifth century élite critics associate cultural degeneracy (in music and poetry) with the naval empowerment of the *demos*. In *Frogs* 1071–2, Aeschylus accuses Euripides' "democratic" (952) tragedy of encouraging sailors to "talk back" to their superiors (*antilegein, antagoreuein*). Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.*, a work that criticizes the bullying hegemony of the oarsmen in democratic Athens (for example, 1.2), indignantly claims that the *demos* has done away with élites who practise traditional *mousike*, which it does not consider *kalon* (and what does it know about what is truly *kalon*!), while it "sings . . . and dances and mans the fleet" to serve its own interests (1.13). See Wilson (1997) 93–4 on this passage. Of course, élite symposiasts could imagine themselves as *symposiou nautai* (Dion. Chalc. fr. 5.2). See Miralles (1993) 510–1 on the metaphor.

The Problem of Polychordia

From these fragmented, yet ideologically consistent “critical scenes” preserved in the prose fragments emerges a picture of Ion as someone invested in the maintenance of élite cultural distinction, and sympathetic to traditional aristocratic/oligarchic notions of musical *proprietas* in the symposium.²⁴ It is surprising, then, that in his own sympotic elegy he denigrates the symbolic core of that *proprietas*, the seven-stringed lyre, and celebrates the ascendancy of a most untraditional instrument, one associated with the most transgressive exponent of the popular New Music, the virtuoso citharode Timotheus of Miletus.²⁵ *Polychordia* indeed emerges in the conservative élite cultural criticism of the later fifth and fourth centuries—comedy, Plato, Aristotle, Aristoxenus—as the most vivid emblem of the excesses of professional virtuoso performers, of the idiotic *poikilia* of the musical innovations that grew out of control under the vulgar *theatrokratia* of radical Athenian democracy.²⁶ The polychord lyre is the decadence, the too-muchness of illicit *kainotomia* (“innovation”)—and the political culture that promotes it—made visible; it is a material deformation of the simple, well-ordered lyric traditions of *archaia mousike*, traditions that one conservative critic, probably Aristoxenus, sums up with a term whose anti-democratic connotations cannot be missed: *oligochordia* ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1137b).

The criticisms of *polychordia* are numerous. A selection: in Pherecrates’ well-known priamel of the New Music ‘anti-canon’, Timotheus’ *kithara* with its “twelve strings” tops the list of the violent transgressions directed against a personified *Mousike* (*Cheiron* fr. 155.25 *PCG*).²⁷ Plato bans from his ideal city all polychord stringed instruments, which he

²⁴ On “critical scenes”, “social occasions in which one person offered a musical performance and another the judgement on it”, see Ford (2002) 3.

²⁵ Timotheus famously vaunts his innovations on the eleven-stringed *kithara* in his citharodic *nomos Persae* 229–31.

²⁶ On the politicized criticism of the New Music see Csapo (2004), especially pp. 229ff. on the assessment of *polychordia*.

²⁷ “Twelve strings” is a hyperbolic comic generalization. Pherecrates also mentions the twelve *chordai* of Melanippides: see West (1992b) 361. Melanippides does not seem to have been a citharode, however. He is known only as a dithyrambist: see testimonia and fragments in Campbell (1993) 14–29. Here *chorde* means “note”, as often (for the seven strings of the lyre represent notes of the various *harmoniai*); the reference is to the employment of a greater melodic range in the composition of *aulos* music. Cf. Düring (1945) 181. Pherecrates could be intentionally drawing attention to the influence of dithyramb on *kitharoidia*, a controversial musical and generic development (see next note).

sees as corrupt *mimemata* of the dreaded *aulos*, the “most polychord” of all instruments (*Rep.* 399d).²⁸ Besides the politically unthreatening *syrix* (intended for rural peasants), he would keep only the seven-stringed lyre and *kithara*, on which citizens would play music primarily in the most traditional, ethically correct mode, the Dorian.²⁹ References to the polychord *kithara* in two post-classical sources reflect the persistence of this political and ethical critical discourse. In Aristides Quintilianus *De mus.* 2.16 it is (negatively) gendered feminine against the “male” seven-stringed *kithara* and lyre. Plutarch advises the savvy politician to manipulate the democratic *polis* with the same complex technique that a virtuoso kitharist uses to play a “many-noted, many-stringed” instrument.³⁰ In comparison, Plutarch figures oligarchic Sparta as the classic seven-stringed lyre—a predictable move, given Sparta’s reputation for musical conservatism, especially in matters concerning the lyre. The many stories about the Spartan ephor’s threatening to cut “extra” strings from Timotheus’ polychord *kithara* at the Carneian *mousikoi agones* are probably apocryphal—anecdotal reflexes of Timotheus’ own self-dramatizing ‘defense’ in his *Persae* against the Spartans, who have reproached him for “dishonoring the older Muse with new songs” (211–12).³¹ However, these stories do seem to offer an accurate reflection

²⁸ At *Laws* 700e, Plato laments the *mimesis* of *aulos* music (itself notoriously given to mimetic sound effects) that has been introduced into *kitharoidia*. Wilson (2003) 183 makes the point that *polychordia* was especially galling to élites because it could be seen as a corrupt attempt to reproduce on the *kithara* the extended melodic compass and harmonic versatility of the ‘demotic’ *aulos*.

²⁹ The Dorian is the ethically and ethnically unproblematic ‘degree zero’ of Hellenic music, the one true Hellenic mode (Pl. *Lach.* 188d), closely associated with citharodic music (see, for example, [Arist.] *Pr.* 19.48, Ar. *Eq.* 989–90), and so preferred by élite critics. Plato’s notorious retention of the Phrygian mode alongside the Dorian has been read as inconsistent with the overall logic of his purgative, lyric reorganization of musical culture, but it speaks to the symbolic power of the lyre. As the context suggests, now that Phrygian music will be played on the lyre, not the *aulos*, it will be restrained, Hellenized, made ethically safe.

³⁰ Plut. *Mor.* (*De unus rep.*) 827b5–8: εὖ δὲ πολυφθόλλῳ καὶ πολυχόρδῳ συνοίσεται δημοκρατία, τὰ μὲν ἀνιείς τὰ δ’ ἐπιτείων τῆς πολιτείας, χαλάσας τ’ ἐν καιρῷ καὶ καρτερῶς αὐθις ἐμφύς, “he will also get on well in a democracy with its many sounds and strings by loosening the strings in some matters of government and tightening them in others, relaxing at the proper time and then again holding fast mightily” (tr. Fowler). The implicit equivalence of a democratic politician with a professional popular musician is, of course, ideologically loaded. For the ‘democratic’ connotations of the musical terms *aniemai* and *chalazēin*, which Plutarch borrows directly from Plato, see Csapo (2004) 243–4.

³¹ The anecdote appears (with minor variations) in Plut. *De prof. virt.* 84a, Dio Chrys. 33.57, Paus. 3.12.10, Cic. *Leg.* 2.39, Boethius *De Musica* 1.1. Other, still more suspect

of a real lyric conservatism in Sparta, which was admired (and surely romanticized) by élite, philolaconizing opponents of the New Music in Athens.³² It seems all the more odd, then, that Ion, a *sympotes* of an earlier generation of philolaconizing élite Athenians, should embrace *polychordia* so enthusiastically.

Should we imagine that Ion had a late-in-life conversion to the new-style citharody practised by his fellow Ionian Timotheus, and sought to emulate it in the symposium?³³ This is unlikely. West has made the point that, although Ion was probably still alive during the early years of Timotheus' career, there is no reason to believe that the Chian's eleven-stringed lyre refers to that played by the Milesian citharode. There is rather good reason to think that such polychord instruments had been around since the middle of the fifth century; 93 Leurini = 32 West could thus have been written at any point in the three decades before Ion's death (though the late 430s-420s seem the most likely window).³⁴ Timotheus, as I will argue below, is responsible not for the invention of the eleven-stringed *kithara* (a belief that is based on an overly literal reading—one doubtless encouraged by this self-dramatizing citharode—of *Persae* 229–31),³⁵ but rather its popularization and ultimate 'democratization' at the public *mousikoi agones* in the years after the death of Ion. Far from imagining that Ion was seduced by a populist politics of citharodic *polychordia* as it was constructed in the discourse of the New Music and its critics, I suggest that he was drawn to the eleven-stringed *kithara* because its very esotericism, its intellectual, anti-popular snob appeal made good sense within the symposium's ideology of exclusivity.

versions, put citharodes of previous generations in the place of Timotheus (Phrynus: Plut. *Ag* 10; Terpander (!): Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 17). See further Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1903) 69ff., Marzi (1988).

³² Csapo (2004) 241ff.

³³ So Duse (1980) 123. There is an anecdotal tradition that makes Euripides an early fan and collaborator of Timotheus (Satyrus, *POxy* 1176, fr. 39, col. 22; Plut. *An seni* 23). The stories probably draw upon the fact that both were contemporaneous 'artists in residence' at the Macedonian court of Archelaus; or they reflect an uncritical acceptance of some comic depiction of the two innovators as conspiratorial fellow-travellers in the Athenian modernist *Zeitgeist*.

³⁴ West (1992b) 62–4.

³⁵ As West (1974) 174 notes.

The Theatrokratization of the Lyre

This ideology was being tested in the second half of the fifth century; the traditional élite investment in ‘string culture’ was becoming devalued by the attempts of the *demos* to hold shares in it as well.³⁶ First, in the Athenian popular imagination, *kitharoidia* was fast becoming not something a symposiast did with his lyre, but what highly remunerated professional citharodes did with their grand concert *kitharai* at the Panathenaic *mousikoi agones*. Agonistic *kitharoidia* was, even in the archaic and early classical period, a mostly professional enterprise—élite amateurs generally played the lyre in private, not the *kithara* on the festival *bema*. But the culture of agonistic music seems to have been actively patronized by the élite at this time. A good indication of the charisma and prestige exerted by competitive *kitharoidia* among upper-class Athenians are the numerous depictions of citharodes in performance, wearing glamorous costumes and playing finely crafted *kitharai*, on black- and red-figured vases from the sixth and early fifth centuries—the same kinds of vessels that often depict music-making in the restricted context of the symposium, and were themselves used at symposia.³⁷ Some scenes of citharodic *agones* also include representations of one or two spectators who, as a rule, appear to be *kaloi k’agathoi* of the cultured élite—stand-ins perhaps for the vase owners themselves. Some are shown sniffing flowers as they listen, lost in what seems to be a state of aesthetic rapture not unlike that which we see enjoyed by drinkers in scenes of sympotic music-making.³⁸ We get the sense of an unproblematic continuity between the public ‘string culture’ in Athens and the private one of the symposium: citharodes are imagined as performing not for the *ochlos*, but for a select in-group. The numerous depictions of Apollo and Heracles *kitharoidoi* also suggest an aristocratic ‘possession’

³⁶ See Mosconi (2000), Musti (2000), Wilson (2004a).

³⁷ See the images, with commentary, collected in Maas and Snyder (1989) 53–78; cf. Kotsidu (1991) 301ff. and her comment, “Die Darstellungen musischer Agone sind mit wenigen Ausnahmen auf Symposion-Gefäßen angebracht . . .” (p. 105); Vos (1986), Shapiro (1992) 65–9. A catalogue of pseudo-Panathenaic amphorae depicting citharodes (and other agonistic musicians), which were probably collected by wealthy private citizens, may be found in Kotsidu (1991) 293–300.

³⁸ See for instance *ARI*² 3.2, Louvre, Paris G1, a red-figure amphora attributed to the Andocides painter; *ARI*² 383.199, Boston 26.61, a red-figure amphora attributed to the Brygos painter; other exemplary images collected in Shapiro (1992)—and see comments on flower-sniffing listeners (p. 62).

of agonistic citharodic culture that is closely tied to the promotion of the Panathenaic *agones* by the Peisistratids.³⁹

Such images become far less common after Pericles' rise to power, however. This development likely indicates an élite turn away from an increasingly democratic re-envisioning of agonistic music in this period. At the center of this democratization of musical culture was Pericles' construction shortly after 450 of a massive public music hall, the Odeion, alongside the heart and soul of demotic *mousike*, the Theatre of Dionysus. Here were housed the Panathenaic *mousikoi agones*, newly reorganized by Pericles, according to Plutarch (*Per.* 13.11), in an attempt to win popular acclaim (*philotimoumenos*).⁴⁰ The Odeion signified on a grand scale a new civic possession—in Plato's terms, the *theatrocratization*—of *kitharoidia*, the premiere event at the *agones*. Athens becomes the most important musical market in Greece, offering large monetary awards to the star citharodes who could win the favour of the *demos*.⁴¹ The mass-élite tensions brought about by this increased popularization and professionalization are reflected in the visual record, as Wilson shows: Apollo now rarely holds in his hands a *kithara*, but rather the gentleman-amateur's tortoise-shell lyre;⁴² the mythological citharodes depicted on pots tend rather to be Easterners (like many of the real-life star citharodes) with problematic relationships to Apollo and the Muses: Thamyras, Linus, even Marsyas.

³⁹ There are several examples of Attic Apollo *kitharoidos* vases from the late sixth and fifth centuries, on which Apollo is depicted singing to the *kithara* at an *agon*. See, for example, *ARV*² 594.62, Boston 97.370, a red-figure oinochoe, and London B260 (*CVA* Br. Mus. 4, pl. 64, 1a (209)), a black-figure neck-amphora that shows, on the obverse, Apollo in citharodic regalia standing alongside Artemis, and, on the reverse, a mortal citharode; other examples are collected at Kotsidu (1991) 215–6, nn25–7. On the *Herakles Mousikos* vases (and their connection to Peisistratid policy), see Schauenburg (1979); Boardman (1975) 10–1; Kotsidu (1991) 113–5, with helpful bibliography (216nn29–33); Shapiro (1992) 69.

⁴⁰ On the Odeion and Pericles' musical policies see now Mosconi (2000); cf. Davison (1958); Shapiro (1992) 57–8. Themistocles is said to have built a 'proto-Odeion' on the same site as the Periclean Odeion. *Vitr.* 5.9.1 claims that Themistocles constructed the roof with the "masts and spars of ships from the Persian spoils". This whole story is perhaps apocryphal; but the close association of the Odeion with the 'democratic' naval victory at Salamis is perhaps a telling reflex of the ideological significance of the building.

⁴¹ First prize in *kitharoidia* at the Panathenaia in the fourth century was a golden olive-branch crown worth 1000 drachmas plus a flat cash award of 500 silver drachmas (*IG* II² 2311). Comparatively, a roughly contemporary inscription from Eretria records a first prize of 200 drachmas (*IG* XII. ix 189).

⁴² Wilson (2004a) 281–7, with Sarti (1992).

Against the changing socio-economic and political climate of public string culture, we might reconsider the class-based reading of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* offered by Norman O. Brown. Brown reads the figure of Hermes as the projection of the “aspirations and achievements of the Greek lower classes”, opposed to the old guard, aristocratic-identified Apollo.⁴³ The hymn, traditionally regarded as the latest of the Hymns to be composed—perhaps as late as the early part of the fifth century⁴⁴—ascribes the invention of the lyre to the upstart Hermes (25–51), who quickly sees the value of the instrument as an object of commercial exchange with an appreciative audience, in this case, his older brother Apollo (435ff.). The *Hymn*, in presenting the inception of ‘show business’ as virtually cognate with Hermes’ invention of *kitharoidia*, may be expressing the contemporary demystification of the noble, transcendent status of lyre-playing as constructed by aristocratic ideology. Hermes *kitharoidos/empolaios* (lit. “concerned in trade”) would thus represent a popular re-imagining of lyre music as an accessible, circulating commodity that is produced and consumed, bought and sold like any other of the *epamoi Bima erga* (“commercial preserves”) that the god has received from Zeus as his *time* (“office”) to manage (516–7).⁴⁵ An Attic red-figure krater dated to around 460 shows Hermes, along with Dionysus—a significant pairing—judging the citharodic performance of a satyr in full stage regalia; we could read this image as a reflection of the same ‘low’ recontextualization of *kitharoidia*.⁴⁶ This undermining of the aristocratic patronage of the *agones* leads to a definitive cut between the exclusive private string culture of the schoolroom and symposium and pandemic agonistic culture; in fact, the boundary between the two becomes vigorously policed by some conservative

⁴³ Brown (1947) 97. Johnston (2002) offers a very different reading of Hermes and the lyre.

⁴⁴ Fifth-century date: Görgemanns (1976).

⁴⁵ The hymn contains the earliest account that we know of Hermes’ invention of the lyre. Apart from this story, the god has no significant connection to *mousike*: see Allen, Halliday and Sykes (1936) 277; Clay (1989) 101. The heurematography of the lyre and *kithara* is itself jumbled and conflicting: Hermes, Apollo, even legendary mortals are named as inventors and cultivators: see Hägg (1989) 62n96; Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1903) 76–7. The varying accounts could stem from conflicting musico-ideological positionings of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Against the rather peaceful negotiation of lyric possession in the hymn, we may consider the more contentious tradition suggested by a bronze sculpture on Mount Helicon (likely fifth/fourth century) described by Pausanias (9.30.1): Apollo and Hermes physically *fighting* over the lyre (μαχόμενοι περὶ τῆς λύρας).

⁴⁶ See Wilson (2004a) 287n45.

élites, lest the vulgar taint of the latter infect the former—a concern that becomes all the more urgent with the popularization of the New Music *kitharoidia* in the later fifth century. Thus we see the old guard *Dikaïos Logos* in *Clouds* 970–2 encouraging the corporal punishment of any schoolboy who would attempt to reproduce on his lyre the virtuoso stylings made popular by Phrynis, a citharode who won a Panathenaic victory, presumably at the Odeion, in the mid 440s.⁴⁷ Aristotle argues that the *kithara* should be left completely out of traditional musical *pai-deia* on account of its being a *technikon organon*, fit only for the banausic professionals at the *agones* (*Pol.* 1341a). Agonistic music is to be avoided by the ἐλεύθερος καὶ πεπαιδευμένος (“free and educated”) now, and left to “the vulgar audience mixed together from mechanics, hired labourers and the like”.⁴⁸

However, the schoolroom and the symposium were not safe refuges for élites intent on preserving their musical hegemony. Andrew Ford has demonstrated that the steady expansion of literary and musical education in fifth century Athens beyond its traditionally restricted realm led to a crisis in élite culture; symposiasts were forced to invent new, more elaborate means to maintain an “elusive musical distinction”.⁴⁹ Nick Fisher, in a study that complements Ford’s, shows the (surprising) extent to which the aristocratic symposium in the later fifth century, its practices and customs, including its music, were becoming more familiar and even accessible to the *demos* at large. These developments motivated some of the wealthiest élites to reaffirm their fading status distinction in part through the introduction of “more shocking or controversial accompanying entertainments”.⁵⁰ To Fisher’s review of passages from Old Comedy that suggest such a demotic incursion into sympotic musical culture, and the élite reactions to it, I would add the distinction made in Plato *Protagoras* 347cd between “low-class and common symposiasts” (τοῖς συμποσίοις τοῖς τῶν φαύλων καὶ ἀγοραίων

⁴⁷ On Phrynis’ victory see Schol. *Clouds* 970 (p. 187 Holwerda) with Davison (1958) 40–1, Hose (1993).

⁴⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1342a19–21: ὁ δὲ φορτικὸς ἐκ βαναύσων καὶ θητῶν καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων συγκείμενος, ἀποδοτέον ἀγῶνας. The logic of Aristotle’s take on *mousikoi agones* is illuminated by *Rhet.* 1367a32–3. Ober (1989) 277 paraphrases: “A man not carrying on a banausic trade (*technē*) was shown to be a free man (*eleutheros*) because he need not ‘live for the sake of another’ (*pros allon zen*)”. Both the agonistic performer and his audience are people “living for the sake of another” and so each complements the other.

⁴⁹ Ford (2002) 207; cf. pp. 194–5 on the role of theatre in the promotion of “mass education”.

⁵⁰ Fisher (2000) 371.

ἀνθρώπων) and “gentlemen symposiasts and educated men” (καλοὶ καὶ γαθοὶ συμπόται καὶ πεπαιδευμένοι); the former enjoy musical entertainments, while the latter enjoy restrained conversation. The distinction is clearly an exaggeration in service of the Platonic Socrates’ valorization of philosophical over musical culture.⁵¹ But the actual banalization of sympotic music no doubt makes the exaggerated rhetoric effective; for those interested in maintaining their distinction, philosophical *logos* is an appealing alternative to a traditional *mousike* that has been socially compromised. It is interesting to note, however, that Socrates himself took advantage of the new openness of once élite-restricted music. Denied access as a boy to training on the lyre, as an old man he takes up lyre lessons, with little success, in the classroom of the *kitharistes* Konnos (Pl. *Euth.* 272c, *Menex.* 235e–6a). A fragment from an unknown comedy by Eupolis imagines Socrates’ performance of a lyric song of Stesichorus—presumably an elementary “recital piece” (*epideixis*) he learned from Konnos—as a travesty of the aesthetic and ethical decorum of the symposium: “Socrates, on receiving the lyre, while singing his recital piece of Stesichorus to it, stole a wine decanter”.⁵² Wilson argues convincingly that Socrates’ late and inept attempt to learn the lyre is a rhetorical play-act that “chips away at the educational capital that still attached to *kitharistike* among the élite, helping to undermine the claims of *mousike* as a source of *sophia*”.⁵³ But again, the philosopher’s act likely gains rhetorical force from the more widespread appropriation of élite string music by lower class strivers. Eupolis’ lampoon of Socrates *lyrikos* in fact plays in to the Socratic critique of music: if this

⁵¹ See Murray (2004).

⁵² Eupolis fr. 395 *PCG*: δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπίδειξιν <ᾧδων> | Στησιχόρου πρὸς τὴν λύραν οἰνοχόην ἔκλεψεν. I prefer to retain the τὴν ἐπίδειξιν that is transmitted in our source for the first line of this fragment (the Aldine scholion to *Clouds* 96). The reading in *PCG* is τὴν ἐπίδεξι, “the to-the-right”, an insider sympotic term that refers to the direction of the lyre’s passage among singers (see the discussion in Storey 2003: 322). This emendation is needless; worse, it kills part of the joke. “*Epidexis*” sounds odd when applied to the performance of lyric song in the studiously informal symposium (again, see Storey); but that is the point. The word is used to describe formal, practised, public displays, generally of rhetoric, but also music (for example, Pl. *Laws* 658b, *SIG* 703.6). Edmonds (1957–61) 435 understands it this way: “I take τὴν ἐπίδειξιν as ‘his show-piece’ such as schoolboys performed for prizes . . . during the Apaturia (cf. Pl. *Tim.* 21b)”. “His *epideixis*” suggests the inappropriately studied, childishly practised manner of Socrates’ performance—his “recital”—of the Stesichorus song. (A song that was perhaps by then a tired chestnut along the lines of a “Für Elise”? Cf. Eupolis fr. 148 *PCG*).

⁵³ Wilson (2004a) 301.

inept, uncouth man can make a go at lyre-playing in the symposium, where he clearly does not belong, then the distinction of that activity has really been compromised—better to study philosophy!

Alternative' String Cultures

Some élites, unwilling to compete with the *demos* in the patronage and practice of public and private string culture, did turn away from the lyre entirely; *rhētorikē* and *philosophia* offered more enticing opportunities to shore up political influence and socio-cultural capital. We think of Pheidippides' 'sophistic' rejection of his father's lyre (*Clouds* 1350). But others, as Ford and Fisher suggest, sought to stake out new positions of exclusivity and distinction within sympotic string culture by adopting esoteric, experimental and exotic alternatives to the traditional seven-string lyre. Such a strategy represents a classic élite response to the appropriation by the lower classes of their status symbols, which has been discussed by Margaret Miller in regard to luxury goods such as clothing and utensils in Classical Athens. Élites stay ahead of the curve, assiduously adopting new, elaborate (or renewed) versions of these symbols in order to assure the continuity of their social distinction.⁵⁴

Wilson sees the emergence of one alternative string culture in the sympotic circle of Critias based around the *barbitos*, the elongated, deeper-toned version of the lyre associated with the music of Sappho, Alcaeus and especially Anacreon.⁵⁵ This instrument was never played in public contexts, but was clearly a common musical resource in the super-élite symposia of the late sixth and early fifth centuries, as the corpus of 'Anacreontic vases' vividly illustrates. The visual record implies, however, that it dropped out of use by the middle of the fifth century even at symposia. But it was indeed the 'retro' appeal of the *barbitos*, and its current unfashionableness, that drew Critias to adopt it in the later part of the century: it had never been tainted by use in civic festivals, nor had it fallen into the hands of low-class sympotic strivers. Its exclusive aristocratic pedigree was therefore impeccable.

The fashion for polychord harps of Lydian and Phrygian provenance such as the *pektis*, the *trigonon* and the *magadis* at Athenian symposia in

⁵⁴ Miller (1997) 253.

⁵⁵ Wilson (2003) 190–3.

the second half of the fifth century represents a related, if far more controversial, development in alternative string culture.⁵⁶ *Barbitoi* and harps were regularly associated with one another, not necessarily because of similar sound or construction, but due to a shared exoticism and the overlapping contexts in which they were played. Pindar, in fact, attributes the invention of the *barbitos* to Terpander, who was inspired by the *pektides* played at Lydian banquets (fr. 125).⁵⁷ Aristotle was scandalized by his “forefathers’” use of these instruments—which Aristoxenus calls, disparagingly, *ekphula organa* “alien instruments” (fr. 97 Wehrli)—and tried to give their strange enthusiasm a positive spin by chalking it up to a naïve, “indiscriminate” propensity for learning of all sorts (*Pol.* 1341a31–2). But these Asiatic harps in fact played a part in a most discriminating socio-cultural strategy. The élites who adopted them were following a long tradition of asserting status by importing luxury goods from the East.⁵⁸ Harps—expensive, exotic, visually arresting polychord instruments—served as potent symbols of social differentiation in an increasingly undifferentiated string culture. They were marked at the visual and sonic levels with the oriental *habrosune* (“luxury”) that had been integral to the ideology of distinction in the archaic symposium.⁵⁹

Like the *barbitos*, the harp did not leave the confines of the domestic or sympotic-komastic environment, except for occasional forays on the demotic stage of comedy, where its music is roundly condemned as “low”, decadent, immoral—a characterization probably true on all counts. It is connected in a fragment from a comedy of Plato to the louché tradition of Ionian songs.⁶⁰ But it is Gnesippus, an Athenian

⁵⁶ On these exotic harps see West (1992b) 70–5.

⁵⁷ By the 420s, Aristophanes was actually conflating harp and *barbitos*. In a discussion of his predecessor Magnes (*Knights* 520–3), the participle ψάλλον, the scholia tell us, refers to the older poet’s *Barbitistai*: Aristophanes is transfiguring the *barbitos* (struck with a plectrum) into a harp (plucked). Theocritus 16.45 takes this further, imagining the *barbitos* of Simonides as *polykhordios*.

⁵⁸ Miller (1997) 250ff. Indeed, the musical traffic—in instruments, musicians, modes, rhythms and other stylemes—between East and West had for long been channelled through symposia (with the élite lyric circles on Lesbos as a key intermediary). In a fascinating fragment from a late fifth or early fourth century dithyramb (810 *PMG*), Telestes of Selinus evokes a primal scene of East-West musical confrontation, set significantly at a symposium: the companions of Pelops (συνοπαδοὶ Πέλοπος) are imagined making Asiatic music—singing the Phrygian tune (*nomos*) of the Mountain Mother to auletic accompaniment, plucking Lydian harps (*pektides*)—“alongside the wine-mixing bowls of the Greeks” (παρὰ κρατήρας Ἑλλάνων).

⁵⁹ Kurke (1992).

⁶⁰ Plato *Com.* 71.12–14 *PCG*: a girl singing a *melos Ionikon* to a *trigonon* at a wealthy symposium. On ‘indecent’ Ionian songs see Ar. *Eccl.* 883, 890–9, 911–8; *Thesm.* 170; Pl.

melopoios of the 440s–430s, who is most closely associated with sympotic harp music. The intertwined themes of *malakia*, sexual excess, and hedonistic oriental *truphe* that mark the comic depictions of Gnesippus, suggest that around the harp was organized a suite of transgressive behaviours—cross-dressing, narcissistic self-display, Lydianizing—that recalled those through which an earlier generation of symposiasts had ‘performed’ their distinct otherness vis-à-vis the wider civic community.⁶¹ That the harp seems to have been played rather widely by women in Athens—the oft-observed preponderance of female harpists in vase-paintings suggests this—no doubt played into comedy’s gendered riffs, and at the same time perhaps added to the exotic allure of the instrument for its male enthusiasts.

Cratinus fr. 276 *PCG* describes Gnesippus as a tragic *didaskalos* leading “his chorus of hair-plucking slave women plucking [as on the harp] their gross songs/limbs in the Lydian style/mode” (διδάσκαλος | . . . παρατιλτριῶν | ἔχων χορὸν Λυδιστὶ τιλ- | λουσῶν μέλη πονηρά). Hordern has argued convincingly against taking this passage at face value; Gnesippus is no *didaskalos*. Rather, we should locate his “chorus” within the symposium. Hordern identifies the chorus, as the grammatical feminines imply, with hired harp-girls and *hetairai*.⁶² But it is more likely that Cratinus is imagining a group of “effeminate” elite symposiasts engaged in some questionable musical and cosmetic practices, plucking harp strings and leg hairs—the two are wittily conflated in the punning language. Two points here: first, to figure such a group as a tragic chorus is entirely (in)appropriate—tragic *choroi* were, after all, made up of Athenian men, who, on occasion, dress up as (enslaved, Asiatic) women and sing. The joke could cut two ways: a swipe at a perceived decline in tragedy, always a comic obsession; and/or an attempt to undercut the pretensions of the alternative harp culture by assimilating it into the structures of the mainstream civic culture against which it reacts.⁶³

Rep. 398e; Heraclid. Pont. *ap.* Ath. 625c. At *Frogs* 1301ff. Aeschylus accuses Euripides of composing tragic music in a variety of obscene, ‘low’ styles, including “Milesian *scolia*”. See also Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1903) 66n2; West (1992b) 349n96.

⁶¹ On such “playing the other”, see Lissarrague (1990); Kurke (1992).

⁶² Hordern (2003) 613. Cf. Davidson (2000), who makes the elaborate argument that Gnesippus was a composer of *paignia*, “lyric mimes” that were performed at private parties. Davidson’s article is fascinating, but Hordern’s less elaborate take—Gnesippus wrote songs, not dramatic productions—is more convincing.

⁶³ Cf. Cratinus fr. 20 *PCG* (where a joke is made about Gnesippus’ being unfit even to train a chorus for performance at the women’s Adonia), with Hordern (2003) 612.

Something like the latter gesture may be behind Ion's own *Omphale*, which likely featured a chorus of satyrs in Lydian drag, playing harps in a sympotic environment. The identity of the chorus is not certain, but *Omphale* does command a group of "Lydian harp-girls" to "adorn" their guest, Heracles (that is, dress him in women's clothes): ἄλλ' εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτριάι, παλαιθέτων | ὕμνων ἀοιδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε, "Now you Lydian harpists, singers of ancient songs, adorn the guest" (26a Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22 = Ath. 634ef).⁶⁴ The usual comic themes are here: Lydianizing, luxurious softness, transvestism. "Singers of ancient songs" is probably ironic: these satyr harpists in 'real life' would sing only the latest tunes of Gnesippus (cf. Eupolis fr. 148 *PCG*).

Second, while depilation was practiced by hired dancing girls (for example, *Frogs* 516), it was also associated with pathic homosexuals and adulterers, for whom genital depilation was a notorious punishment.⁶⁵ And Gnesippus is portrayed in other comic fragments as a sort of perverse musical *didaskalos* of Athenian *moichoi*. His songs "dwelt on adultery", περὶ μοιχείας ἀναστρέφεσθαι (Teleclides fr. 36 *PCG*).⁶⁶ He appears on stage in Cratinus' *Malthakoi* (note title; tr. Edmonds, "*The Softies*") speaking about erotic matters (fr. 104 *PCG*). Eupolis has a character or a chorus claim that, "It is out of date to sing the songs of Stesichorus, Alcman and Simonides. Gnesippus is the one to hear. He invented night-time songs for adulterers, holding the *iambuke* and *trigonon*, to call out married women" (fr. 148 *PCG*).⁶⁷ This last fragment reveals the deep source of comedy's violent reaction to harp culture: it is perceived as the perversion, emerging scandalously from within the ranks of the musical elite themselves, of traditional lyric culture, and the socio-political order supported by it. The harp generated its own style of 'New Music' within the symposium that portended the larger-scale excesses of the 'New Music' in the city.

⁶⁴ 26b Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F23 = Ath. 634ce has a reference to another kind of harp, the *magadis*. See West (1983b) 79, and Easterling and Maitland in this volume.

⁶⁵ Ar. *Plut.* 168, Lucian *Fug.* 33.

⁶⁶ See the remarks in Davidson (2000) 42 on the sense of this phrase.

⁶⁷ Eupolis fr. 148: τὰ Στησιχόρου τε καὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος Σιμωνίδου τε ἀρχαῖον ἀείδειν· ὁ δὲ Γνήσιππος ἔστιν ἀκούειν. κείνος νυκτερίν' εὖρε μοιχοῖς ἀείσματ' ἐκκαλεῖσθαι γυναῖκας ἔχοντας ἱαμβύκην τε καὶ τρίγωνον. The *iambuke* is a short-stringed harp of Eastern provenance: see West (1992b) 75–7. Aristid. Quint. *De mus.* 2.15.85 says that it is a "female" instrument, "since it lacks nobility and incites people to abandonment because of its very high pitch" (tr. Barker 1989: 488).

Ion's eleven-stringed lyre, I suggest, represents the esoteric, intellectual equivalent of the 'exotic' reconfiguration of string culture centred on the harp. Ion plays the politics of *polychordia* on a different instrument, but aims at a similar end, the reassertion of socio-musical distinction in the symposium. The traces of social ideology in 93 Leurini = 32 West are faint and uncertain, but I think we can detect the outlines of some nonetheless. Let us consider, first, the negative characterization of the *mousa* of the seven-stringed lyre as *spania*. The adjective is usually translated to mean "scanty" in an aesthetic sense: seven strings do raise a thinner, more limited music than eleven. But "scanty" perhaps misrecognizes the socio-economic implications of the word; it may not be going too far to understand it to mean "poor". The adjective *spanios* never seems to have this exact meaning, but in poetry it does not mean "scanty" in the sense it must here, either.⁶⁸ The substantive *spanis* is, however, several times used in fifth century poetry and prose to denote economic poverty and lack of means.⁶⁹ Restoring *spania mousa* to the socio-economic register, while still recognizing its aesthetic resonance, elucidates the status-consciousness of Ion's rhetoric. "All Greeks"—and we should note the potentially negative idea of indistinction and commonness latent in this phrase—plucked the heptachord lyre, raising only a "poor music".⁷⁰ Playing this instrument is made to seem déclassé, a banal work of the hands.

The verb *ψάλλον* is puzzling, but perhaps plays into this rhetoric. Lyre and *kithara* strings were typically not plucked with the fingers, as were harp strings, but struck with the plectrum. The verb we expect here is *krouein* "to strike a note (with the plectrum)".⁷¹ West suggests that *psallein* refers to a special technique whereby the player plucks strings with his left hand while his right strikes with the plectrum, but this particular usage seems out of place here.⁷² The verb is more likely negatively marked. I would make two very tentative suggestions. First,

⁶⁸ LSJ s.v. *spanios*. Its use in poetry is indeed very rare. At Eur. *IA* 345, 1162 it means "rare". Note one prose attestation of the word as "scanty" at Thuc. 7.4 (of a city's water supply).

⁶⁹ LSJ s.v. *spanis* II.

⁷⁰ πάντες "Ἕλληνες carry an extrasympotic reference to the panhellenic and big regional *agones*, such as the Panathenaic, where *kitharoidia* was especially popular (see above). Perhaps relevant is the contrast drawn between Πανελλήνων ἀγοραί and θαλία ἀνάκτων at 89 Leurini = 26.3 West = Ath. 447d; on which see Katsaros in this volume.

⁷¹ See LSJ s.v.

⁷² West (1992b) 66; West (1992c) 27.

plucking lyre strings (with the right hand) may in some cases have been considered an indecorous or unsophisticated technique. In Plato *Lysis* 209b, *pselai* is contrasted with *krouein*, with the implication that the latter is proper technique, the former undisciplined fooling around. Compare the proverb, “It’s as easy as plucking a string!” (ῥᾶρον ἢ τις ὄν χορδὴν ψήλειε: Aristid. *Or.* 26.31). Second, is there an echo in *ψάλλον* of comedy’s critique of harp culture? If so, it is a bold manoeuvre indeed—a deliberately catachrestic figuring of the seven-stringed lyre as the harp, its ethically dubious ‘other’. As we saw above, Ion likely appropriated comic tropes to lampoon harp enthusiasts in his *Omphale*.

An élite-focalized socio-economic rhetoric informs the striking metaphor employed by Pheidippides in his rejection of his father’s (seven-stringed) lyre at the symposium. “To play the lyre and sing while drinking”, he says, is to act like “a woman hulling barley” (*Clouds* 1357–8). The sympotic lyre-player is grotesquely figured as his socio-economic ‘other’: a poor woman singing work songs as she goes about the most mindless, menial of tasks. And could not such a figure also be evoked in *spania Mousa*—a “poor Muse” belonging to an instrument that has lost its prestige and distinction? The Muse is subject to a variety of critical characterizations in later fifth century poetry. The most well known of these is Euripides’ Muse, whom Aeschylus summons in *Frogs* 1305ff., gotten up as either an old hag or a prostitute, playing *ostraka*, lowly percussion instruments.⁷³ Like this debased Muse, who rises from the lower classes to disgrace the propriety of the tragic stage with the vulgar musical style she represents,⁷⁴ the “poor Muse” emblemizes the debased aesthetic and social value of the heptachord lyre—an unwelcome and inappropriate presence in the symposium, bringing in what should be kept outside.⁷⁵

⁷³ Dover (1993) 351–2. Related figures: Pherecrates’ personified *Mousike* (*Cheiron* fr. 155), perhaps costumed as a down-on-her-luck hetaira—see Lloyd-Jones (1981) 25; the Μοῦσα παλαιά dismissed by the iconoclastic Timotheus (796 *PMG*; cf. his *Mousa neoteuches*, the Spartans’ *Mousa palaiotera*: 791.203, 209–10 *PMG*). Phrynichus wrote a *Mousai*, probably featuring a chorus of metamusical Muses (see Harvey 2000a: 100–8). On these and other metapoetic female figures, see Hall (2000).

⁷⁴ Aeschylus criticizes the low, immoral sources of Euripidean music; it borrows from prostitutes’ songs, Milesian *scolia*, Carian *aulos* tunes, etc.: *Frogs* 1301ff.

⁷⁵ I wonder, too, if the ancient spectre of Penia is not lurking behind, and animating, the rhetoric of *spania Mousa*. Martin (2001) has produced an intricate study of the poetic and socio-political aspects of personified Penia in Theognidean elegy. Aristocratic symposiasts are vigilant to make sure that Penia always remains *outside* the confines of the symposium: “The two phenomena, symposium and Penia, are mutually

By contrast, the hendecachord lyre is marked by a surplus of material, sonic and theoretical riches. I would like to focus on these last, for indeed we get the sense from the first couplet of 93 Leurini = 32 West that the new lyre's real value lies in its being the object of a difficult, high intellectual theoretical discourse. It allows one to do, or—better—display, theory at a level one could not with the seven strings and two tetrachords of the older version. And such display is of course not socially disinterested; rather, it is a canny performance of the intellectual and cultural capital of the poet, one whose very obscurity assures that only an exclusive group with access to similar capital will understand it.

One scholar has seen the influence of Pythagorean music theory in 93 Leurini = 32 West, with some reason.⁷⁶ Ion does express admiration for Pythagoras in 92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120. And the lack of emphasis on the empirical perception of the eleven-stringed lyre could be seen to reflect Pythagorean musical idealism. But praise of the lyre as a material, 'worldly' instrument seems out of keeping with the Pythagorean interest in music as a reflection of transcendent 'cosmic' order.⁷⁷

Ion's enthusiasm for the new lyre seems rather to reflect interests in the more empirically oriented 'harmonic' theory that was emerging in the later fifth century.⁷⁸ The *harmonikoi* were devoted to exploring the intervallic articulation of individual modes (Dorian, Mixolydian, etc.) and *genera* (diatonic, enharmonic, chromatic), and to determining the potential inter-relationship between these structures.⁷⁹ Stringed instruments, easily tuned and re-tuned (in comparison to the *aulos*), were especially useful to this sort of 'research'. Harmonic theory has practical applications: it is essentially aimed at organizing knowledge about 'real'

repellent" (p. 64). Especially relevant here is the observation that "Penia, as the cause of speechlessness [for example, Hes. *Op.* 178] is ... the enemy of poetic performance at the symposium" (p. 69).

⁷⁶ Huxley (1965) 38.

⁷⁷ There is an anecdote (83A6 DK) about the sophist Lycophron, identified by Nierdermeyer (1939) 166 as a Pythagorean. When asked to praise (*epainesai*) the lyre, instead of dwelling on the "sensible" (*aisthete*) lyre, Lycophron performs an encomium of a "heavenly" (*ourania*) one—that is, the stellar constellation called the Lyre—a rhetorical manoeuvre that perhaps reflects the speaker's Pythagorean ideals. Cf. Scythinus fr. 1 West, a poem that invokes a "cosmic" lyre.

⁷⁸ West (1992c) 25–6 has noted the connection between Ion's poem and early harmonic theory.

⁷⁹ On the *harmonikoi* see Barker (1978), Wilson (2004a) 287ff.

music, as is music theory taught in conservatories today (in contrast to the theoretical speculations studied in musicology PhD programs). By the fourth century, it is embraced by professional musicians and teachers, and accordingly scorned by élites who define themselves against such professionalization of *mousike*.⁸⁰ We do not know much about early *harmonikoi*, but they do not seem to have been professionals; like early musical ethos theorists such as Damon of Oa, they likely worked within restricted élite intellectual circles.⁸¹ Ion is clearly no professional teacher of theory. The first couplet of 93 Leurini = 32 West is not in any way a didactic elucidation of musical principles—witness the interpretative struggles that continue today among learned historians of music theory. The theoretical discourse inspired by the new lyre seems rather to be enlisted in the service of *remystifying* string music, reclaiming it for a select élite.

We can contextualize this manoeuvre within a distinctive tradition of sympotic poetry that aims exactly at mystifying the equipment and practices of the symposium: the riddle (*griphos* or *ainigma*). We have only a few riddles that involve musical instruments, but I suspect these represent a wider tendency.⁸² In Plutarch's *Symposium of the Seven Sages*, Aesop performs a *griphos* that he attributes to the riddling elegist Cleobulina: "A dead ass struck my ears with a horn-bearing shin".⁸³ The 'answer' to this riddle is, of course, the *aulos*. (Plutarch helpfully tells us that *auloipoioi* made the shafts of *auloi* from the tibiae of asses because these bones "sound better".) In discussing the riddle, Aesop paraphrases another riddle about the *aulos*: "It is amazing that the ass, exceedingly fat and unmusical in other respects, yields a most thin and musical bone". The terms of the logical paradox in both recall the descriptions of the tortoise whose shell is used to make the lyre: the tortoise, though voiceless in life, emits a voice in death.⁸⁴ These lyre riddles appear only in non-sympotic poetry, but given the collocation of lyres and riddles in the symposium, we can assume that this institution

⁸⁰ Pl. *Rep.* 531b; *PHib* 23ff, with Barker (1984) 185. See Wilson (2004a) 290–1 on Stratoniceus, the fourth century professional citharist and teacher of harmonic theory.

⁸¹ See Rossi (1988) on the development of ethos theory within the symposium.

⁸² See Martin (2001) 63; Stehle (1997) 221 on musical riddles.

⁸³ Cleobulina fr. 3 West = Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 150e: κνήμηι νεκρὸς ὄνος με κερασφόρῳι οὐδ' ἔκρουσεν. The verb *krouein* is a *double entendre*: it also means "to play (strike) a note". Cf. a related *aulos* riddle at *Anth. Pal.* 14.14.

⁸⁴ *Hom. Hymn to Hermes* 37–8; *Soph. Ichn.* 300; *Nic. Alex.* 560–63. See the discussion of the silent tortoise/speaking lyre paradox in Svenbro (1992).

was their point of origin.⁸⁵ These and other metasymphotic riddles are playfully framed, but they have a deeper purpose: to test and affirm their recipients' claims to membership in the exclusive symphotic group.⁸⁶

Ion's address to the hendecachord lyre articulates a related socio-poetic strategy. It is not, strictly speaking, a riddle, but rather a form of *epainos*, praise, as his description of the heptachord lyre is a kind of *mos*, blame. *Epainos*, as codified in the aristocratic poetry of Theognis and Pindar, is semantic and generic sibling to the riddle (*ainigma*); both descend from the *ainos*, "a mode of poetic discourse that is unmistakably understandable only to its intended audience", as one scholar describes it.⁸⁷ To interpret correctly the coded 'ainetic' language of both riddles and praise poetry is to prove your worth among the *sophoi* and *sunetoi*.⁸⁸ This definition of the aristocratic in-group on the basis of its advanced poetico-musical and symphotic 'understanding' has a long history—Ion is merely upping the intellectual ante. If you have the *sophia* and the *sunesis* to interpret the recondite mix of theoretical constructions and kenning metaphor Ion uses to praise the new lyre—the "ten-step arrangement" and "concordant road-junctures of attunement"—then you are a connoisseur worthy of membership in string culture as Ion conceives it.

As I noted above, 93 Leurini = 32 West reflects a more general trend towards obscure metasymphotic descriptions in fifth century elegy: for example, the baroquely complex praise of wine in 89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d; the enigmatic description of *cottabus* in Dionysius Chalcus fr. 3; or the ornately detailed catalogue of symphotic luxury goods in Critias fr. 2. We might read the enigmatic, recondite style of these fragments, as I have suggested for 93 Leurini = 32 West, as a politicized response to the banalization of symphotic culture. This is

⁸⁵ Cf. Thgn. 1229–30, a riddle about a trumpet (made with a conch shell): "For a corpse from the sea has called me homewards; though dead it speaks with a living voice".

⁸⁶ Martin (2001) 73.

⁸⁷ Nagy (1985) 24, commenting on Thgn. 681–2. On the semantic and generic relation between *epainos*, *ainigma* and *ainos*, see Nagy (1979) 238–42; Edmunds (1985) 105–8.

⁸⁸ For example, Pind. *Ol.* 2.83–85: πολλά μοι ὑπ' | ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη | ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας | φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἑρμανέων | χατίζει, "I have many swift arrows under my arm in their quiver that speak to those who understand, but for the whole subject, they need interpreters" (tr. Race); Thgn. 681–2. See the discussion in Battisti (1990) 5–6 on the importance of intellectual distinction in aristocratic self-definition.

clearly language that is attempting to (re)define a most exclusive sympotic audience.⁸⁹ A related trend in fifth century elegy is an inclination to sophisticated formal and generic experimentation—witty metapoetic in-jokes that assume a highly cultured audience. The fragments show various metrical novelties, not surprising given the research on metre being conducted by élite intellectuals such as Damon in the later part of the century.⁹⁰ Athenaeus reports that Dionysius Chalcus began a poem with a pentameter line (602c).⁹¹ Critias famously could not fit the name of Alcibiades into the elegiac metre and so, “with a new manner of song”, inserted it into an iambic line (fr. 4). Wilson has expertly uncovered the politics latent in this metrical and generic gamesmanship. Alcibiades, that most demotic of élites, is accommodated with difficulty in Critias’ élite symposium just as the iambic line, a metonym for the demotic poetry of drama, is accommodated in sympotic elegy only by bending the metrical rules.⁹² Might there be some implicit metrical punning in 93 Leurini = 32 West as well? It would be difficult to imagine that Ion did not appreciate the coincidental but still aesthetically satisfying match between the eleven strings of the lyre and the eleven *metra* of the elegiac distich. The instrument is an ideally measured ‘fit’ for sympotic elegy.

Conclusion: The Hendecachord Lyre Goes Mainstream

It is impossible to determine to what extent Athenian symposiasts actually embraced the hendecachord lyre. Presumably the group of élites at Ion’s level of musical and intellectual sophistication was relatively limited. And probably the instrument, like the harp, was a controversial addition to the symposium. Two roughly contemporary images on sympotic vessels reveal radically divergent attitudes to the polychord lyre. On a red-figure krater dated c. 440–430 (*ARV*² 1038.1, Ferrara VT T617), Apollo is shown at that most paradigmatic aristocratic celebration, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, playing what is distinctly

⁸⁹ See Miralles (1993) 510. Cf. Wilson (2003) 199.

⁹⁰ Damon’s metrical theories are probably parodied in *Clouds* 638ff. Clearly they are still novel and obscure in the 420s. See Wallace (2004) 258; Ford (2002) 18 offers relevant observations on the ethical connotations of *metron*.

⁹¹ See Miralles (1971) 15. Dion. Chalc. fr. 1 West may be the poem Athenaeus mentions.

⁹² Wilson (2003) 198.

an eleven-stringed *kithara*.⁹³ Given the general trend in the iconography away from images of Apollo *kitharoidos*, this (re)union of the god with the lyre in its polychord form is significant. However, on an oinochoe by the Meidias Painter dated c. 420–410 (*ARV*² 1314.16, Ruvo, Jatta 1538), the polychord *kithara* (of ten strings) is in the hands of Thamyras. His audience of Muses is listening with marked displeasure, as we would expect from the treatments of the Thamyras story in *Iliad* 2.594–9 and Sophocles' *Thamyras*. And with the Muses stands Apollo, who, notably, does not play a role in extant literary versions of the story.⁹⁴ The god, lyreless, also listens critically; his back is turned to Thamyras and he holds up the index finger of his left hand in what seems to be a dismissive gesture.

The oinochoe of the Meidias Painter is, however, probably a decade or so younger than the krater: Apollo's rejection of the polychord lyre on the former may not be a reflection of any intra-sympotic controversy, but rather a negative reaction to its popularization at the *agones* by Timotheus of Miletus. I suggest that this popularization can be tied specifically to the citharode's successful performance of his *Persae* in Athens, probably in the years around 412–408.⁹⁵ I do not have the space here to discuss at any length the full complexity of the discursive strategies through which Timotheus constructs a distinctly *democratic* rhetoric of legitimization for his innovative musical practices, in particular his use of the eleven-stringed *kithara*.⁹⁶ However, I will make some brief points. First, note the obvious fact that the polychord lyre is enlisted in the service of musically commemorating what is perhaps the keystone of Athenian democratic ideology, the naval victory at Salamis—the same *ergon ariston* that Aeschylus had famously “adorned” at the Theatre of Dionysus more than half a century before (*Frogs* 1027). On the *bema* in the Odeion alongside the theatre, Timotheus is enacting, in a most ‘dramatic’ way, the democratization of this instrument.

This idea is reinforced in the closing section of the *nomos*, the *sphragis*, a kind of *parabasis* where the citharode speaks of his music *in propria persona*. Here Timotheus articulates a vision of a completely undiffer-

⁹³ Reproduced in Berti and Restani (1989) 57.

⁹⁴ Froning (1971) 76–7 suggests that Apollo's role in the *agon* between the Muses and Thamyras was a dithyrambic innovation; but Burn (1987) 57 argues convincingly against the influence of any such dithyramb on this vase.

⁹⁵ See Bassett (1931) and Herington (1985) 151–60.

⁹⁶ See Wilson (2004a) 304–6, who discusses Timotheus' self-representation in *Persae* 202–12 as an “honorary Athenian” put upon by conservative Spartan authorities.

entiated string culture, an almost ‘Whitmanesque’ democratic musical utopia that is the polar opposite of the closed Spartan society that attacks him (202–12): “I keep neither any young man nor old man nor man my age away from these songs of mine” (ἐγὼ δ’ οὔτε νέον τιν’ οὔ- | τε γεράν οὔτ’ ἰσήβαν | εἵργω τῶνδ’ ἐκάς ὕμνων: 213–5).⁹⁷ We should understand the important metaphor at lines 231–3 of the *sphragis* as a further elaboration of this communitarian vision. With his eleven-stringed *kithara* (229–30), Timotheus “makes the art of lyre-playing spring up anew, opening the many-songed, chambered treasure-house of the Muses” (κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει, | θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἷ-|ας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν). The association of the hendecachord lyre with abundance and plenty is reminiscent of the socio-economic metaphor underlying 93 Leurini = 32 West. But Timotheus significantly relates the music of the instrument to—indeed situates it within—the *thesauros*.⁹⁸ As Neer has argued, *thesauroi* are important sites in the negotiation of aristocratic and civic ideologies. They are public ‘frames’ imposed upon the private offerings of an élite, converting “upper-class ostentation into civic pride”.⁹⁹ Timotheus is exploiting these ideological resonances of the *thesauros* to underline a critical reconversion of cultural capital, the demotic appropriation of the hendecachord lyre, formerly an inscrutable status symbol of the musical élite. The professional agonistic citharode has refashioned the instrument and its music as ‘public property’. It is no surprise, then, that *polychordia* arouses such violent reactions in fourth century élites. Their nostalgic valorization of seven strings is, after all, the flip side of the same desire to establish and maintain distinction that drew Ion to praise eleven.

⁹⁷ This rhetoric of inclusivity may have an appropriately ‘choral connotation’ to it, specifically a reference to the three age-grouped *choroi*, one of old men, one of mature men, one of boys, that performed in sequence at Spartan festivals (cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 21, *Inst. Lac.* 15; Pollux 4.107; further references at 870 *PMG*). Timotheus is by no means suggesting that his music should, or could, be performed by such choruses; but rather that his new *hymnoi* are by no means incompatible with the sort of broadly inclusive *mousike* represented so paradigmatically by this traditional choral institution. Timotheus’ appropriation of this *Spartan* institution to serve his ‘democratic’ musical ideology is typical of his rhetorical craftiness; Timotheus was as much a virtuoso rhetorician as citharode.

⁹⁸ Timotheus borrows the metaphor from Pind. *Pyth.* 6.5–9, where the epinician ode is figured as a *hymnon thesauros*. The appropriation of this aristocratic metaphor is again typical of Timotheus’ *détournement* of ideologically opposed poetic and political capital. See, however, Kurke (1991) 189 for the “inclusive” connotations of Pindar’s *thesauros*.

⁹⁹ Neer (2003) 129.

CHAPTER TEN

SNOWY HELEN AND BULL-FACED WINE: ION AND THE LOGIC OF POETIC LANGUAGE

MICHAEL CLARKE

Introduction

Ion's generation is the first in Greek history for which we can claim biographical acquaintance with individual poets engaged in the development of a common verbal art. It was Ion's distinction that he was both a participant in this project and a commentator upon it: on the one hand composing in tragic, lyric and elegiac modes, on the other hand compiling, in his prose *Epidemiai*, an account of his interactions with other poets and intellectuals of the time. In the absence of extensive survivals from the *Epidemiai*, the nature of this latter activity can only be guessed at; but it is hardly a coincidence that the most substantial surviving chunk of the work (of which more will be said below) involves Sophocles not only flirting with a boy but also discoursing on the semantics of poetic adjectives.¹ Our sense, then, is of one poised between what D  tienne calls *exegesis* and *interpretation*, between exploration of poetic discourse within its own communicative framework and investigation of the discourse from a distanced or quasi-objective viewpoint outside.² This makes it especially thought-provoking that among Ion's poetic fragments there are several examples of deliberate and self-conscious strategies for poetic expression, involving the startling or anti-traditional matching of words to referents to which they do not conventionally belong. In this essay I will present a selection of such examples to explore some of the communicative strategies that may

¹ Discussed further below. On the subject-matter of *Epidemiai* see especially Jacoby (1947a); Huxley (1965); Lefkowitz (1981) 67–9, 80–1.

² D  tienne (1981a) *passim*.

be involved when a poet engages in “semantic stretch”³ of the kind nowadays conventionally known as metaphor.⁴

Snowy Helen

I begin with a single stray collocation of name and epithet:

νιφόεσσα Ἑλένη· ἀντὶ τοῦ λευκή. Ἴων Φρουροῖς.

Snowy Helen: standing for *white*. Ion in the *Phrouroi*.
(55 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F46 = Hsch. v 601)⁵

When we face a scrap like this, stripped naked of any semblance of context, the challenge of interpretation or translation takes on stark contours. Why did Ion call Helen “snowy”? Evidently Hesychius’ gloss is only a stop-gap, and the image was more than a woolly elaboration of “white” or “pale”; but if we are to reach a more satisfactory conclusion we must tread carefully. Avenues open up before us towards two distinct kinds of interpretative strategy, which I will call the *geometric* and the *spiralling*.

The geometric strategy seeks to explain the image on the basis of a simple and regular mapping from one conceptual domain to another: on these lines it might, for example, be argued that the image of Helen is assimilated to that of a mountain, so that the light in her shining hair is matched to the gleam of the snow on the summit, or alternatively (and more evocatively) the slaughter caused by her elopement or abduction engenders horror and misery corresponding to the coldness of snow (compare the semantics of the word ῥῆγος, “frost”, “cold”).⁶

The spiralling strategy, on the other hand, resists an answer reducible to such simple correspondences. The image is allusive, hinting, startling: Helen is not “snowy” in any comprehensible sense whatever, and the

³ This usefully non-committal term is Geoffrey Lloyd’s: see most recently Lloyd (2003) 8–9.

⁴ I am not concerned in this article with the modern cognitive theory of metaphor (on which see Kövecses 2002), and I use the word in a pre-theoretical sense, to refer to any instance of word-use where a lexical item has been transferred to a referent in a different conceptual domain from that where it would normally be applied.

⁵ On the variant σελήνη (Phot. 301.7) see Porson (1822) 301; Schmidt (1862) 230; Naber (1864–5) 1: 448 n1; Snell (1971a) 109; Leurini (2000a) 36.

⁶ See also Stevens in this volume for further interpretations of this fragment. Cf. Eur. *Hel.* 214–6.

point of the image is its very refusal to be pinned down, on foot of which the listener is challenged to think about the central woman of Greek myth in a way that is many-layered, uncomfortable, subversive. The more we reflect on the collocation of words, the more slippery and suggestive they become; and, on this basis, not one but both of the geometric explanations become potentially included in the potentially limitless range of meanings subsumed in a single adjective.

A sophisticated version of the spiralling strategy for interpreting Greek poetic language has been advanced in a series of recent publications by Michael Silk. Silk's starting-point, as I understand it, is the perception that Greek poetic discourse includes two distinct and irreconcilable patterns of communication, the one *defamiliarizing* and the other *conventional*. Language which defamiliarizes is language whose strangeness, its unexpected collocations, its semantic indeterminacy, mean that it "not only puts the spotlight on itself, but forces its listeners or readers to listen afresh",⁷ in order to "startle its audience into a new response";⁸ and it achieves this effect precisely through its refusal to submit to easy or specifiable strategies for mapping a string of words to a meaning. Conventional language submits readily to such taming: it is of its nature that such mappings can be carried out, and that meaning can be extracted from an utterance like the contents of an unwrapped parcel.⁹ For Silk, a defamiliarizing metaphor is not reducible to any neat or diagrammatic model based on substitutional geometry:

We are aware of an underlying analogy, but not of exactly what it is . . . , and for the efficacy of the image that inexactness may be—exactly—what we need.¹⁰

Although much could be written to query the intellectual credentials of this approach,¹¹ Silk's dichotomy makes a good frame for an inquiry into the communicative strategies of early Greek poetry. In the particular case of "snowy Helen", the lack of context prevents us from assembling a definite answer or choosing between the alternatives offered by Silk; but it is our duty nonetheless to develop a reasoned policy as to which

⁷ Silk (2001) 33 on Pind. *Pyth.* 8.95–7.

⁸ Silk (2001) 39. Cf. Silk (2002) 156–8.

⁹ Cf. Reddy (1993).

¹⁰ Silk (2003) 127.

¹¹ Silk's dependence on and use of the work of the Russian Formalists, especially Roman Jakobson, is beyond the scope of this article.

of the alternatives is more likely, or whether there is some third route to an answer that is more satisfactory.

When this poetry was first heard, audiences must have brought particular interpretative strategies to bear on their listening, and the poet himself must have been concerned to anticipate and predict those strategies; there must, in effect, have been an established grammar of poetic imagery in the speech-community on which the poet implicitly depended in framing his words: and our duty to reconstruct and characterize that grammar is no less pressing and no less practical than our duty to understand the ordinary rules of Greek syntax. So we face a fundamental question, a question that applies potentially to any challenging or strange-sounding poetic expression: if we are to hear this poetry through ancient Greek ears, should we expect to do so through spiralling or through geometric patterns of thought?

Among Ion's fragments there are clues to an answer, in the shape of images which seem bizarre, and even extravagant, but offer positive signals to guide the listener's understanding. Sometimes we are squarely in the realm of the conventional, with established patterns of image-making simply pushed a little further than previous poets might have done. People without foresight have "wrapped-around souls", *καταφράκτοις ψυχαῖς* (*Alcmene* 7 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F6 = Hsch. κ 1495), plainly drawing upon dualistic images like the Pythagorean *σῶμα χιτῶν ψυχῆς* (see Empedocles 113/126 Inwood, *Pl. Phd.* 87b2ff.); to move swiftly when obeying an order is to be "winged underneath", *ὑπόπτερος* (*Laertes* 18 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F14 = Ath. 267d); where others had compared foreigners' voices to those of swallows (for example, Aesch. *Ag.* 1050–1),¹² Ion refers to barbarians directly as *χελιδόνας* (*Omphale* 36 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F33 = Schol. Ar. *Birds* 1680; Hdn. 1.25.18 Lentz).

Similar in principle is what seems to be a metaphor of dancing in a description of excited emotion: *ἐκ τῶν ἀέλπτων μᾶλλον ὄρχησαι φρένας*, "because these things were so unexpected, your heart has danced even more" (60* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F50 = Ath. 21a; Eust. 1942.4). Extravagant though this may sound, it is easily reduced to conventional sense. Aeschylus has something very like it, *ὄρχεῖται δὲ καρδία φόβῳ*, "your heart dances with fear" (*Cho.* 167),¹³ and in earlier tradition it has easily recognizable antecedents—Homeric psychology is full of images of the thought-stuff in the breast leaping and surging

¹² See Schol. Ar. *Birds* 1680 (the source of our Ion quotation).

¹³ Compare Pl. *Ion* 536b8: *ὄρχεῖταί σου ἡ ψυχῇ*, "your soul dances".

in strong emotion¹⁴—so it seems that Ion has simply taken an existing collocation of ideas and pushed it a little further in the direction of concreteness.

In the examples collected so far, the impression is of creative imagery kept within strict bounds of caution: where word-use is novel, it is so in a way that can easily be traced and understood within the resources of convention. Witness now an example that seems more strange at first blush, in a passage where a bird-catcher seems to be describing the tools of his craft:

δρυός μ' {εν} ἰδρώς
καὶ θαμνομήκης ῥάβδος ἢ τ' Αἰγυπτία
βόσκει λινουλκός χλαῖνα θήραγρος πέδη

The sweat of the oak,
the wand long as a bush's height, the Egyptian
wool-spun garment, beast-catching fetter: these provide my food.
(*Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]* 43 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F40 = Ath. 451d)

Athenaeus (who quotes the lines for the sake of this bizarre expression) preserves the explanation that the “sweat of the oak” is mistletoe: and there is no reason to doubt that interpretation. If so, the image can be understood as a metaphor in the ‘classic’ English and Aristotelian sense of the word, depending as it does on a transference based on analogy:¹⁵ mistletoe is to trees as sweat is to bodies, so the poet names the one as the other and the reader-listener follows the imaginative leap precisely.

Ion is the source for a number of examples of this precise kind, as when he names the *aulos* as a cock, “crowing out its Lydian song”: ἐπὶ δ' αὐλὸς ἀλέκτωρ | Λύδιον ὕμνον ἀχέων (*Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]* 42 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F39 = Ath. 184f–185a; cf. 54 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F45 = Ath. 185a). Such metaphors are in fact miniature riddles, like Old English kennings; and if there is radical creativity in them it is of a strictly tamed and localized kind, submitting easily to simple geometric interpretation along conventional lines.

¹⁴ Clarke (1999) 104–6.

¹⁵ This is the fourth of Aristotle's species of μεταφορά, κατὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον (*Poet.* 1457b6–24).

Bull-Faced Wine

However, the full picture is less simple than that. It is significant that the examples so far cited have all been from tragedy. It has been recognized that in sympotic poetry, suffused as it is with the more exuberant mood associated with Dionysiac states of mind, a peculiarly allusive and sidelong style of expression may have been customary; and although the survivals offer little enough substance to work with from this genre, we see some remarkable examples of Ion moving on a less tractable level of communication.¹⁶ Witness a bizarre evocation of the ripening of grapes:

ἐξ οὗ βοτρυνόεσσ' οἰνὰς ὑπὸ χθονίων
 πτόρθον ἀνασχομένη θαλερῶι ἐπτύξατο πῆχει
 αἰθέρος· ὀφθαλμῶν δ' ἐξέθορον πυκινοὶ
 παῖδες, φωνήεντες ὅταν πέσει ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλωι,
 πρὶν δὲ σιωπῶσιν·

... from the time when the grape-bearing vine, lifting the bough up from under the earth, reaches out into the high air with flourishing arm; and the crowding children leap out from its eyes, finding voice when one falls on another, though before they are silent.

(89 Leurini = 26.4ff. West = Ath. 447d)

What is going on here? How can grapes be called the “children of the eyes” of the vine? The connection of thought seems to begin, as in the previous example, from a metaphor based on simple transfer across domains: the vine is imagined as a human form, with its branches as arms and its buds as eyes. But when the grapes, emerging from these “eyes”, are named as “children”, a different avenue of verbal imagination must be followed to trace the logic of the words. Greek customarily names the pupil of the eye as a girl, κόρη;¹⁷ the usage is a simple polysemy rather than a living metaphor as such, and Plato explicitly works it out on the basis that when you look into someone’s eyes you see an image of a little person reflected there (*Alc.* 133a).¹⁸ So the second part

¹⁶ See especially Bartol (2000); cf. Bowie (1986); Gentili (1988) 89–104.

¹⁷ See LSJ s.v. III. Attestations include Empedocles fr. 103.8 Inwood; Soph. *TrGF* F710; Eur. *Hec.* 972; Ar. *Vesp.* 7; and, coincidentally, Ion 63* Leurini = 746 *PMG* = *TrGF* 19 F53 = Philo *Quod omn. prob.* 134. *Wasps* 7 and *Hecuba* 972 imply that the word can refer to the eye as a whole, but Pl. *Alc.* 133a and the Empedocles fragment show that the precise point of reference is the pupil.

¹⁸ See Denyer (2001) *ad loc.* for discussion.

of the riddle depends on a leap of purely verbal association, working through the polysemy of a word which is not actually heard, but whose presence in the discourse is implied by the use of a neighbouring term in the same semantic field. This pun or conceit or figurative usage (one at least of those labels must be appropriate) is an example of poetic language reflecting upon itself, finding new expressive resources in the latent implications of inherited vocabulary.

This remarkable example leads me to a further, more subtle instance of the same kind of poetic reflexiveness. The context is again sympotic, and comes in a string of figurative expressions naming wine itself:

ἄδαμον¹⁹ παῖδα
ταυρωπόν, νέον οὐ νέον,
ἡδιστον πρόπολον βαρυγδούπων ἐρώτων,
οἶνον ἀερσίνοον
ἀνθρώπων πρύτανιν.

... untameable child, bull-faced, young yet not young,
sweetest attendant of heavy-resounding Erotes,
wine uplifter of thought,
ruler of men...

(86* Leurini = 744 *PMG* = Ath. 35de)

Most of the expressions here refer straightforwardly enough to the power of alcohol and the erotic associations of the symposium: but why is wine described as “bull-faced”? Ostensibly, this might refer to the mythical pattern whereby Dionysus can manifest himself as a bull (see, for example, Eur. *Bacch.* 618, 1017); but this is not fully satisfactory, because the overall imaginative pattern of the passage avoids the direct one-to-one equation of wine with the personal Dionysus (cf., for example, Eur. *Bacch.* 278–85, *Cyc.* 519–23).

As with the children of the vine’s eyes, the connection of thought depends on the semantics of another word altogether. The adjective οἶνοψ/οἶνωπός, “wine-faced”, is one of the family of mysterious and archaic adjectives that seem to involve colour as well as qualities of light and movement, and which are distinguished from Homer onwards by the association of each with a limited range of strangely diverse referents.²⁰ Nowadays, of course, the most famous application of οἶνοψ/οἶνωπός, is the Homeric collocation ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον (*Il.* 1.350 (var.),

¹⁹ Leurini (2000a) 48 prefers ἄδαμον.

²⁰ For full discussion, see Clarke (2004).

Od. 1.183, etc.), “over the wine-faced sea”; but equally ancient, and in antiquity more persistent, is the application of the adjective to the hides of cattle. In Homer, this occurs only in the dual-number formula βόε οἶνοπε (*Il.* 13.703, *Od.* 13.32, etc.), “a pair of wine-faced cattle”; but it is found elsewhere, from names or descriptions of oxen in Mycenaean records²¹ to Pasiphae’s grotesquely vivid description of the Minotaur’s father in Euripides’ *Cretans*:

ἔς τί γὰρ βοὸς
βλέψας' ἐδήχθην θυμὸν αἰσχίστηι νόσῳ;
ὥς εὐπρεπῆς μὲν ἐν πέπλοισιν ἦν ἰδεῖν,
πυρσῆς δὲ χαίτης καὶ παρ' ὀμμάτων σέλας
οἰνωπὸν ἐξέλαμπε περ[καί]νων γένυν;

What could I see in a bull, to wound my heart with such distress, so shameful? Was it the sight of his pretty clothes? The gleam of wine-red light that shone from his eyes and auburn hair? The beard that was dark on his chin? (Eur. *Cretans* fr. 82.11–15 Austin, tr. Page 1941: 75)

In our fragment of *Ion*, it seems, the sense depends on thinking through the peculiar semantic range of οἶνοψ/οἰνωπός and then reversing it: just as oxen can be called “wine-faced”, so the poet can call wine “bull-faced”. This is a riddle, but one whose solution will have emerged easily to a consciousness steeped in the peculiarities of the Greek poets’ linguistic inheritance.

“Purpling” Utterances

If this example were isolated, I would not feel confident to present it as more than speculation. However, by what seems to be coincidence, we have further evidence that the poets of *Ion*’s generation were given to deliberate reflection on, and manipulation of, the strange semantics of inherited words of precisely the type represented by οἶνοψ/οἰνωπός. A remarkable word-use in Sophocles offers an extremely close parallel to *Ion*’s figure:²²

²¹ Gallavotti (1957); Lejeune (1963); Palmer (1963) 164–85; Petrushevski (1961); Killen (1992–3); Blakolmer (2000).

²² Cited by Irwin (1974) 18n31.

AN. Ἦδη καλῶς καὶ σ' ἐκτὸς αὐλείων πυλῶν
τοῦδ' οὐνεκ' ἐξέπεμπον, ὥς μόνῃ κλύοις.
IS. Τί δ' ἔστι; δηλοῖς γάρ τι καλχαίνουσ' ἔπος.

ANTIGONE: I was sure of it; and that is why I fetched you here outside the courtyard gates, so that you alone would hear.

ISMENE: What is going on? For you are clearly purpling some utterance. (Soph. *Ant.* 18–20; *sim.* Eur. *Heracl.* 40)

The word translated as “purpling” must approximate to the meaning “thinking, meditating, brooding upon”. The verb καλχαίνω is built on κάλχη, a synonym or near-synonym of πορφύρα, the murex shell from which the dye called purple was extracted: and the logic of its application to pondering or silent thinking depends on a peculiar web of associations around the adjective πορφύρεος itself. This adjective, conventionally translated “purple”, seems to refer not only to a range of colours from red to blue to purple but also to heaving and wave-like movement, being used of such things as heavy rugs and garments, blood, clouds²³ and the sea;²⁴ and it is associated either by etymology or coincidence with the verb πορφύρω, which names the heaving movement of waves and also the mental activity of one who ponders in deep thought.²⁵ The whole web of associations is drawn together by Homer in a psychological simile:²⁶

ὥς δ' ὅτε πορφύρῃ πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῷ
ὀσσόμενον λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα
αὐτως, οὐδ' ἄρα τε προκυλίνδεται οὐδετέρωσσε,
πρὶν τίνα κεκριμένον καταβήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς οὔρον,
ὥς ὁ γέρων ὄρμαινε δαϊζόμενος κατὰ θυμόν
διχθάδι', ἢ μεθ' ὅμιλον ἴοι Δαναῶν ταχυπώλων,
ἦε μετ' Ἀτρεΐδην Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιμένα λαῶν.

Like when the great sea surges with a heavy swell, awaiting the swift coming of the shrill winds, and it does not roll forward one way or the other until a gust comes down, despatched by the sky-god—so the old

²³ Garments and cloths, for example, *Il.* 3.126, 8.221, 9.200, 24.644–5, 24.796, *Od.* 4.115; blood, *Il.* 17.360–1, cf. 5.83; cloud, *Il.* 17.551. It is harder to explain why the word describes a rainbow (*Il.* 17.547).

²⁴ For πορφύρεος of a surging wave see especially *Il.* 1.481–2, cf. 16.391, 21.326.

²⁵ The main attestation is formulaic: ἔστη, πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη πόρφυρε μένοντι (*Il.* 21.551; *sim.* *Od.* 4.427 = 4.572 = 10.309), “He stood still, and his heart heaved many things as he waited”. See Clarke (1999) 87–8 with n66.

²⁶ I have discussed the metaphorical structure of this simile elsewhere: Clarke (2001) 334–5.

man pondered, divided twofold along his thought-breath whether he should go after the main host of the Achaeans of the swift foals, or after Agamemnon, shepherd of the people. (*Il.* 14.16–22)

For Homer, then, the heaving movement of the sea conceptualizes the movement of deep thought in the breast, and the verb πορφύρω implicitly associates the phenomenon with the colour produced by the purple murex. By linking that sequence of ideas in full, sense can be extracted from Sophocles' use of the verb καλχαίνω as referring to deep reflective thought.

The picture that emerges, then, is of Ion as a participator in a poetic discourse which is willing to reflect on its inheritance, even to play games with the semantic peculiarities of the traditional poetic language. Cultural self-consciousness is the key factor here. It is a coincidence, but a revealing one nonetheless, that the poetics of the colour purple are the subject of the most substantial surviving story from Ion's *Epidemiai*.²⁷ There, the point seems relatively simple: a pedantic schoolteacher objects to the poetic application of the adjective πορφύρεος to a boy's beautiful cheeks, on the grounds that paint of that precise hue would make the cheeks ugly, and Sophocles answers by showing him that it would be absurd to interpret the descriptive adjectives of the poetic tradition in visually literal terms. It is a simple story, but it serves as a reminder of the intellectual adventure in which Ion and his contemporaries were engaged—and simultaneously engaged in the creation and dissection of the poetic tradition of which they were a part.

Conclusion: Ion's Logic

I return to the dichotomy between conventional and defamiliarizing language, between geometric and spiralling lines of communication. The usages which we have examined from Ion are indeed strange and novel, and their effect must have been to unsettle received assumptions about language and to awaken a listener to new levels of attention to the peculiar patterns of word-meaning. But what is remarkable about these verbal experiments is that they take place within straitened limits; in each case the novel or startling phrase poses a semantic puzzle, and

²⁷ 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d, cited and discussed by Irwin (1974) 18.

when the meaning is grasped, the puzzle is solved—what is expressed collapses into the more humdrum foundation on which the edifice was built.

In other words, the strangeness of Ion's language disappears once its codes are understood. In this sense, the logic of Ion's poetic language is geometric rather than spiralling, and despite the unconventional oddity of his verbal experiments, their challenge is essentially that of a game. Maybe this, or something like it, is what the author of *On the Sublime* was talking about when he said that one play of Sophocles was worth Ion's whole tragic output (T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = *Subl.* 33.5); maybe Ion was merely clever when others in his generation wielded language on the level of genius. Or perhaps that impression is an illusion, and our sense of Ion's poetic faculty would be utterly different if we did not depend so much on a selection of quotations dominated by the choices made by Athenaeus.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

STAGING EMPIRE AND OTHER IN ION'S SYMPOTICA

ANDREA KATSAROS

τῷ δὲ ἡμετέρῳ χορῷ οἶνος φίλος †ον

θυρσοφόρος μέγα πρεσβεύων Διόνυσος,
[φησὶν Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις:]
αὕτη γὰρ πρόφασις παντοδαπῶν λογίων,
αἷ τε Πανελλήνων ἀγοραὶ θαλίαι τε ἀνάκτων,
ἐξ οὗ βοτρυόεσσ' οἰνάς ὑπὸ χθονίων
πτόρθον ἀνασχομένη θαλερῶι ἐπτύξατο¹ πήχει
αἰθέρος· ὀφθαλμῶν δ' ἐξέθορον πυκινοὶ
παῖδες, φωνήεντες ὅταν πέσῃ ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλῳι,
πρὶν δὲ σιωπῶσιν· παυσάμενοι δὲ βοῆς
νέκταρ ἀμέλγονται, πόνον ὄλβιον ἀνθρώποισιν,
ξυνὸν τοῦ χαίρειν φάρμακον αὐτοφύες.
τοῦ θαλίαι φίλα τέκνα φιλοφροσύναι τε χοροὶ τε
τῶν ἀγαθῶν <

> βασιλεὺς οἶνος ἔδειξε φύσιν.
τῷ σὺ πάτερ Διόνυσε, φιλοστεφάνοισιν ἀρέσκων
ἀνδράσιν, εὐθύμων συμποσίων πρύτανι,
χαῖρε· δίδου δ' αἰῶνα καλῶν ἐπιήρανε ἔργων
πίνειν καὶ παίζειν καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν.

But to this chorus of ours, it is Wine, high-honoured thyrsus-bearing Dionysus, that is dear. [So said Ion of Chios in his elegies]. This has been the theme of all kinds of writers, the gatherings of united Greeks or feasts of princes, from the time when the clustering vine raised her young branch from beneath the earth, and was enfolded in the air with her lush arm; and from her bud-eyes leapt forth densely-packed children which scream until they fall upon one another: before, they were silent. And when they have ceased their shouting, they are milked of a nectar, a prosperous toil for all men, a self-grown drug to bring pleasure; whose dear children are feasts and fellowship and dance. King Wine showed

¹ ἐπτύξατο (West; Leurini); on other conjectures (ἐπορέξατο, for example, in Campbell 1992), see Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1927) 282; von Blumenthal (1939) 21; West (1974) 172; Leurini (2000a) 51.

up the nature of good men. To you, father Dionysus, being the joy of garlanded men, the prytany of the cheerful feast: "Hail!"; and grant a long life, you helper of fine deeds, to drink and to have fun, and to think about matters of justice.

(Ion of Chios, elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d)

Where is Ion's Voice in All This?

"Often if you removed the metre you would find political rhetoric". So said Dionysius of Halicarnassus with reference to the poet Alcaeus, who, we know, was a master of the metaphor.² Few have thought of Ion's poetry in the same light, mainly because the perennial assumption of his Athenophilia has never encouraged any further investigation into *his* peculiar imagery and idiosyncratic use of metaphor. I wish to explore and expose unacknowledged or latent themes and motifs, and for reasons which I will develop more fully, I suggest that a reading strategy receptive to suggestions of dissent, disenchantment and difference will be valuable.

To elucidate, consider this: when we read Alcaeus, we think we know what is going on simply because of the amount of ancient testimony to his social situation and political embroilments: all these facilitate our interpretations enormously. How does a corresponding *lack* of information about Ion affect our reading of his works? Fragmentary authors are generally categorized into collections of 'history', 'philosophy', 'drama', etc., and tend to be read in isolation from the rest of their works. Therefore, if we read *only* Ion's poetry, it is unsurprising that a hitherto unquestioned image of him as a '*traditional*' sympotic elegist has become generally accepted. However, if we read these elegies in tandem with other of his works, the ambit of our critical licence is widened immensely and significant revelations become available to us.

Let us consider symposia: conventional features of sympotic literature are wine, music, girls, the pouring of libations, the invocation of Dionysus and other gods, references to the trappings of the sympotic setting and to memory.³ Ion *appears* to conform to the 'letter' of the 'rules' of the symposium in sympotic literature, as elegy 90 Leurini =

² Dion. Hal. *De imit.* 31.2.8 Usener-Radermacher.

³ Curiously, on Chios, the Muses were known as "Remembrances" (*Mneiai*) since they caused the poet to remember: Détienne (1996) 41.

27 West also illustrates (see below). However, let us remember that the two undisputed texts which make up our *prose* sympotic 'canon'—Plato's *Symposium* and Xenophon's *Symposium*—are testimony to how symposia, and their recordings, were flexible according to the demands of the atmosphere and the degree of seriousness. There *were* rituals, but there were also numerous interchangeable features and entertainments, which could be serious or amusing,⁴ emphasized or played down according to the individual recorder's purpose. Xenophanes, the Theognidea, Xenophon and Plato all exemplify this:

ATHENIAN: . . . Shall we lay it down that, of the numerous kinds of social institutions, that of banqueters and banquetings (ξυμπότας καὶ ξυμπόσια . . . ξυνουσίαν) forms one? . . . Now has anyone ever yet beheld this institution conducted correctly (ὀρθῶς)? Both of you can easily answer—"never yet at all", for with you this institution is neither customary or legal; but I have come across many modes of banqueting in many places, and I have inquired into nearly all of them, and I have scarcely seen or heard of a single one that was in all points correctly (ὀρθῶς) conducted; for if any were correct at all, it was only in a few details, and most of them were almost entirely on the wrong lines. (Plato *Laws* 639de, tr. Bury, with minor adaptations)

For example, compare Plutarch *Quaestiones convivales* 621c: "for the drinking party is a passing of time over wine which, guided by gracious behaviour, ends in friendship" (tr. Clement), with a Theognidean 'take' on the symposium:

My head is heavy with drink, Onomacritus, and wine is holding me back; I am no longer the dispenser of my own judgement and the room is spinning. Come on, let me rise and see if perhaps wine's in charge of my feet as well as my wits. I fear I may do something stupid in my cups and have much criticism to bear. (Thgn. 503–8)

Compare too this (prose) anecdote at Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* 445ef:

Once a fellow-drinker saw the wife of Anacharsis at the symposium and said to him, "You have married an ugly woman, Anacharsis". He answered "Yes, indeed, I think so too; come on, boy, fill up a stronger cup so I can make her good-looking".

Blind-sided by Ion's convenient categorization, our perceived notions of form and content have ensured that further investigation has not

⁴ See Bowie (1986) 15–21.

been a priority because his sympotic elegies exhibit the conventional features of sympotic literature. On the one hand, it seems that symposia conformed to a system of 'rules', and ritualistic behaviour governed the order of the occasion. But on the other, these 'rules' seem to be breakable. For instance, Xenophanes' moralizing embargo against "vehement discords"—ἡ στάσις σφεδανός—within the symposium (21B1.23 DK = Ath. 462f8),⁵ would seem to be in stark contrast with certain of Alcaeus' sympotic poetry which, according to Aristotle (*Politics* 1285a) admitted topics such as the tyranny of Pittacus and a castigation of the Mytileneans for accepting it.

Other readings of Ion's sympotic *prose* literature address his selections of the personnel: their represented social, literary and political sympathies, their physiognomy and the settings as well as other situational references. Mythological and historical references are also considered within this purview. I suggest we strip these readings of their assumed Athenocentrism: the presumption of Ion's loyalty to Athens and/or Athenians has rarely been subject to serious debate and, consequently, alternative readings have not entered into the equation. An important corollary to this approach is the reassessment of fundamental notions about Ion's texts. Personal, 'nationalistic', 'unorthodox' voices may reveal an unsuspected, yet congruent, flipside to previous orderings of Ion's staging of Empire and Other. A further question—that of *difference*—provokes challenging, but productive, explorations: what is at stake in alterations and/or omissions within our extant corpus?

What are the consequences and effects of re-reading *apparent* 'norms', to which Ion seems to conform so neatly, in terms of a *perversion* of sympotic presentation? Looking *beneath* the surface of Ion's poetry, *in conjunction with* his prose *sympotica*, we can gain insights into the diverse ways in which he negotiates with his material across the literary spectrum. What I offer is a close analysis of Ion's use of language and his manipulations of metaphor, imagery and other stylistic techniques which serve both to camouflage and reveal our polymathic Chian author.

⁵ Cf. Anacreon fr. eleg. 2 West; Ford (2002) 42–3. See, too, Rösler (1998) esp. 128–9. Xenophanes' sympotic elegy provides an early thumbnail sketch of the 'ideal' symposium (21B1 DK = Ath. 462cf). It is from his 'negative' injunctions that we discover the full, often hidden, variety of sympotic pursuits.

Rethinking Archidamus and Dionysus: 90 Leurini = 27 West

Let us test the water by briefly examining the much-discussed elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West, before moving on to my primary focus—elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West—which has received much less critical analysis.

χαίρέτω ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε·
 ἡμῖν δὲ κρητῆρ' οἰνοχόοι θέραπες
 κιννάωντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις· ᾧ δὲ χρυσὸς
 οἶνον ἔχων χειρῶν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος.⁶
 σπένδοντες δ' ἄγνῳς Ἡρακλεῖ τ' Ἀλκμήνῃ τε,
 Προκλεῖ Περσείδαις τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι
 πίνωμεν, παίζωμεν· ἴτω διὰ νυκτὸς ἀοιδή,
 ὀρχείσθω τις· ἐκὼν δ' ἄρχε φιλοφροσύνης.
 ὄντινα δ' εὐεῖδης μίμνει θήλεια πάρευνος,
 κεῖνος τῶν ἄλλων κυδρότερον πίεται.

Greetings to our king, our saviour and father; and for us let the wine-pouring attendants mix the bowl from silver pitchers; and let him who holds in his hands the golden jug wash it to the base. Making holy libation to Heracles and Alcmena, to Procles and Perseus' descendants, beginning with Zeus, let us drink and have fun; let the singing last all night, let someone dance; begin the gaiety willingly; and if anyone has a shapely woman waiting to share his bed, he will drink more lustily than the rest.

(90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c; tr. Campbell)

The opening line of this elegy has caused much debate—to whom do the words refer? The Spartan King Archidamus? The wine-god Dionysus? The *prytanis* of the symposium?⁷ This dispute on identity arose largely because of the references to the Spartan figures to whom libations are poured, and this in turn gave rise to debate on the symposium's setting. Was it at Sparta? At Chios? At all?⁸ Would the atmosphere created by Ion in this elegy have had appeal for a Spartan at home? Was not this kind of symposium deliberately at odds with the austerity of

⁶ Text: West (1992a) is followed by Leurini (2000a). Cf. Campbell (1992) 362: ὁ δὲ χρυσοῦν | δῖον ἔχων χειροῖν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος.

⁷ For discussions on the possibilities, and this elegy in general, see Jacobs (1798) 314–6; Nieberding (1836) 68–72; Welcker (1836) 439–40; Haupt (1876); Koehler (1894); Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1927) 282–3; von Blumenthal (1939) *ad loc.*; Jacoby (1947a) 7–9; Farina (1961) 65, 83–4; Huxley (1965) 31–3; West (1985) 73–4; Griffith (1988); Fisher (1989) 34–5, 47n50; Whitby (1998); Bartol (2000); Leurini (2000a) *ad loc.*

⁸ “Love-songs and war-songs do not have to be composed in the bedroom or on the battlefield”: Humphreys (1978) 219.

the Spartan *susstithia*?⁹ And how do we account for the address ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε? Why would a Chian refer to a Spartan king as such?¹⁰

Certainly, Spartan references are present: Procles, descended from Heracles and Alcmena, was the ancestor of the Eurypontids,¹¹ and Zeus the beginning of the Perseidai.¹² But why should Ion invoke their names prior to his exhortations for drinking, playing, singing, dancing and sex? Let us remember that Athenaeus records this particular elegy within a discussion of various peoples' sympotic habits, and it is pertinent to consider the moods evoked by his choices. Unsurprisingly, a striking feature of these poems is the extent of *internal* reference to the material trappings and *realia* of the *external* sympotic environment. Lines 2 to 6 detail the preparations that distinguish the sympotic environment; the ritualistic nature of this conceptualization of the sympotic scenario is a conventional trope of sympotic literature.¹³ These building blocks are evident in our earliest instances, one of which is Xenophanes' sympotic poem, conspicuous for its emphasis on purity and piety. The *internal*—literary—rituals demarcate the poem as sympotic just as the *external*—performative—rituals demarcate sympotic space *per se*. Of course, symposia—or, indeed, sympotic texts—are not to be considered as alike in *mood* as they are in *form*, and the degree of 'seriousness' could vary considerably within each privileged environment, and to this, surely, the Platonic dialogues alone testify. In this, elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West offers few surprises.

Consider, again, the moralizing prescriptions in Xenophanes' paradigmatic elegy:

οὐ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτύνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων
οὐδὲ <τι> Κενταύρων, πλάσμα<τα> τῶν προτέρων,
ἢ στάσιος σφεδανάς· τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν·
θεῶν <δὲ> προμηθεῖν αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθὴν.

⁹ Rejecting Ithome, Whitby (1998) 211–22 proposes a Demaratiid symposium in Asia Minor.

¹⁰ See West (1974) 173; Bartol (2000) 186 posits that the addressee likely was Archidamus, but that the words “appear to be the singer's response to what has just been said by someone else”.

¹¹ Whitby (1998) 215 on the honorands and the requirements of metre; pp. 216–7 on Procles and a possible connection with Chios.

¹² See Whitby (1998) 210 on Zeus as the “primary referant” in this elegy.

¹³ A nice shorthand version can be found at Pl. *Symp.* 176a in the comment that after they had dined, “they made libation and sang a chant to the god and so forth, as custom bids, till they betook them to drinking” (tr. Lamb).

... nor to speak at length of the wars of the Titans or Giants or Centaurs, creations of our predecessors, or violent factions—there is nothing useful in them; and it is right always to have a good regard for the gods. (21B1 DK, lines 21–4)

The didactic timbre of the older poem is barely discernable in elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West.¹⁴ We might suspect that sombre approaches to literary ‘doings’ are not entirely consonant with the traditional picture of the drinking lover,¹⁵ nor with the comic intellectualism revealed by *Epidemiai*’s narrator and his fall guys; and perhaps not consonant with the Ion whom Dover suspected of turning *philosophia* into *paignion*.¹⁶

Instead of reading this elegy as Ion’s response to his admiration for Cimon and thus for things Spartan,¹⁷ ought we not ask whether Ion’s ‘Chianism’ is equally, if not more, relevant for its interpretation. Could not Ion be alluding to, and making sport of, the (obvious) chasm between Spartan asceticism—particularly when it is set against a background of Ionian *τροφή*¹⁸—and Chian values by such a (overt, when we think about it!) contrast? Is Ion playing with both stereotypes? Ion’s admiration for Cimon, who did admire Sparta, has led to the assumption that Ion felt similarly. This is hardly a guarantee, particularly when we remember that, in spite of his Spartan leanings and a reputation for conservatism (at least as an adult), Cimon was also into things sympotic like singing and lyre-playing (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6)! And one’s admiration for a man does not necessarily mean that one espouses his politics: our prime example in the ancient world

¹⁴ West (1974) 173 (sensibly) argues for a “strong stylistic link” with elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West (discussed below); cf. Bartol (2000) 186. In the Xenophanes’ poem, the predictable references to *stasis* and *chaos* (destructive to the welfare and security of the polis, for which “peace is a precondition”, Slater (1981) 206) are echoed elsewhere in sympotic poetry. See Slater (1981) *passim*. Note Pind. *Nem.* 9.48: “peace loves the symposium”; see too Ford (2002) 53–66. Ion does not choose to incorporate these conventional ‘wisdoms’. Similarly, at Thgn. 475–8 we read, “I’ve reached the stage where the consumption of wine is most pleasant for a man (μέτρον γὰρ ἔχω μελιτῆδος οἴνου), since I am neither sober nor too drunk”. We also see the importance of “measure” and “moderation” in the mixing of wine and water in due proportions in other texts, such as Euenus fr. *2 West where the “best measure” (the μέτρον ἀριστον) is neither too much nor too little: see Gerber (1988). Such counsels do not appear to be Ion’s preserve.

¹⁵ For example, French (1971) 9. Ion *erotikotatos*: T21ab, 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41.

¹⁶ Dover (1986) 31.

¹⁷ Huxley (1965) 31–3; cf. Jacoby (1947a) 9. Bartol (2000) 191 does not agree, suggesting that Ion encourages the symposiasts “not to glorify the Spartan ruler”.

¹⁸ See Harvey (2000) 282n4 for references.

is Thucydides' attitude toward Pericles. We cannot logically presume that Ion admired Sparta wholesale.

Let us note the following uses: ἡμέτερος (1) and ἡμῖν (2); πίνωμεν, παίζωμεν (7). First of all, whoever the "king and saviour" is—and I prefer the arguments for Dionysus—the use of the first person plural highlights the concept of sympotic unity, while exhortation and direct address to the symposiasts underscore the group ties.¹⁹ As previously noted, an ancient symposium can function as a microcosm of the polis, and we should not be surprised that participants of common social status and shared intellectual interests should express themselves in the language of contemporary ideological discourse. After all, we know that cohesion was important for the orderliness of the ancient polis, and in our extant literature, and to this end, we may distinguish the psychology of the symposium as a *select* gathering in the reflexive use of the prefix *syn-* and the "technique of direct address".²⁰ It is Ion's use of the latter which suggests that the audience is being encouraged by Ion to behave as themselves (as Chians?), as distinct from that stern brotherhood of the Peloponnese. Let us consider that Ion's use of the first person plural serves as a signpost for the unification of the symposiasts: this has intriguing implications for Ion's 'nationalistic' voice. We cannot be certain that Ion's 'mask' (discussed below) is not operating in this elegy. Primary meanings which carry secondary nuances ensure that a shadow of doubt always remains: camouflage is possible—censure is avoidable. The intricate network of ingenuity, combined with traditional presentation, which informed the sympotic environment (within both poetic and prose constructs) is clear.

We ought to think in different terms. Regardless of (a) *whether these were real events or not*, and (b) *where the author's genuine political sympathies lay*, the symposium-context affected presentation, themes, seriousness of intent, length, constituents and number of audience: the participants of a symposium themselves would have altered these factors.²¹ No two

¹⁹ In elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West this "unity" is reinforced by two uses of *pan-*: παντοδαπῶν and Πανελλήνων, the latter further buttressed by ἀγοραῖ. Is it a deliberate strategy of this elegy to open the elegy's audience to "all"—as opposed to the notion of a Chios/Athens polarization?

²⁰ Murray (1991) 98. We note that in elegies 89 Leurini = 26 West and 90 Leurini = 27 West, the prefix *syn-*, a 'generic' signposting in sympotic literature is absent: the 'psychology' of the symposium as well as its private and élite status as a *select* gathering is often reflected in its use. See Murray (1991) *passim* (after Snell) on this connection.

²¹ For instance, apparently break the rules and become more intellectual and epid-

symposia—or indeed *synousiai*—are alike. While conforming to the ‘rules’ of sympotic poetry by offering examples that are overtly metasymphotic, Ion has chosen to toast the heroes/forbears of the Spartans, of all people, with wine poured into luxury items of silver and gold goblets and encourage drinking, playing and singing and bedfellows . . . One might well wonder whether a Spartan—king or not—would have thought this was entirely appropriate. And let us not forget that Ion’s affiliation with the Athenian intelligentsia, conducted as it was in a *private* (we presume) sphere, conceivably allowed him to make ‘in-jokes’ of a sort that he could not have paraded in public. Perhaps we might liken the *tone* of this elegy to that of a *paignion*.²² Indeed, given the fragment of his satyr play *Omphale* (27 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F24 = Ath. 690b; see p. 277), we have good reason to accept the possibility.

Athens and Chios

Let us now turn to elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West. First, let us look at the relationship between Athens and Chios with a view to re-thinking the conventional wisdom of their “allied”—and I would question whether that is an appropriate term—solidarity, and the effect this may have had on our Chian’s *psyche*. Herodotus records that the Ionians and the Athenians fought with common cause against the Persians during the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 9.106), and therefore the Chians were the Athenians’ allies. Indeed, they contributed ships to the cause of the Delian League and from Thucydides we understand that they appear to have remained loyal to Athens during the Samian revolt (Thuc. 1.116) and the Sicilian expedition (6.43). Whatever gratitude the Chians might have felt, initially, about the intervention of Athens during the Ionian revolt, it is clear that, from the foundation of this “league”, it was Athens who was in charge: Athens set up the office of Hellenotamiai; the “board” decided which “allies” would contribute money, and which would contribute ships (Thuc. 1.96).²³ Note that Thucydides’ very next chapter describes Athens’ increasing control over her “allies” (1.97):

eictic than sympotic (see, for example, Xen. *Symp.* 4). See, too, the interesting discussion of Aloni (2001).

²² Cf. Bartol (2000) 188–9, 191 on Ion’s ironic “transgressions” of hymnic formulae in this “unique example of sympotic production”.

²³ See Blanshard in this volume on the irrationality of this distinction.

Initially the Athenians commanded autonomous allies and made their decisions in general congresses. Their supremacy grew during the interval between the present war and the Persian wars, through their military and political actions . . . against the barbarians, against their own allies in revolt, and against the Peloponnesians whom they encountered on various occasions.

We know from Thucydides, too, that suspicion came to exist between the two states, to the extent that the Chians were made to pull down their walls in 425/4 (Thuc. 4.51). Let us remember, too, that Aristotle wrote unequivocally on Athens' subjection of the Chians (*Pol.* 1284a38). The fact that the actual revolt of Chios against Athens (412 BC) did not occur until some years after Ion's death is not, as such, under scrutiny here. However, given Thucydides' ability to analyze events and motives, surely we have reasonable cause to wonder how a Chian, even before the revolt of his native island, might have reflected on what was, in effect, a means of imperial control. (For a full treatment of this issue, see Blanshard in this volume.)

Truth Games

It is imperative to bear in mind the extent to which 'truth' becomes a casualty when disguised by a selective use of features and/or language which traditionally informed sympotic works. Let us look at *Epidemiai* because it offers one example of the privileged literary 'space' available to the re-teller of such 'events'.²⁴ A paradigm of the 'proper' symposium may be presented in the account, preserved by Plutarch, of the party in Athens, at which Ion as a young lad (μειράκιον) met the notable Athenian general Cimon (106* Leurini = *FGH* 392 F13 = Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–6). Cimon elaborates on his military prowess, describing his "shrewdest" coup concerning the prisoners from Sestos and Byzantium. We are offered a picture of the archetypal Athenian leader at work and at play—a man favourably contrasted with Themistocles, whose skills were limited *merely* to making "a city great and rich". Within the sympotic environment, Cimon's range of sympotic abilities, his skill with voice and lyre, ups the ante. I suggest that it would be naïve indeed *not* to question how much sophistry is at work in this passage.

²⁴ We note that the partial passages in question have been excised from their original context; we must supply both opening and closure.

And we should certainly resist a programmatic reading of Ion's 'second' symposium on Chios: again, we see an Athenian general at play—but this time, it is Sophocles, who is behaving cleverly (δεξιῶς),²⁵ and an older Ion (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). As in the Cimon episode, we see an Athenian general who offers a demonstration of his 'strategic talents'; talents which are, again, essential and integral to the symposium. In a mock self-deprecating manner, "flirtatious"²⁶ Sophocles wins the day—the occasion and the moment are his in this literary and erotic 'victory'. In *this* context, his success far outweighs Pericles' rather negative assessment of Sophocles' ability as a general.²⁷

This *seemingly* conventional symposium abounds with studied 'literariness'; the language of painting and *simulacra* might suggest that a conventional reading misses much. In the final fillip, the boy becomes the "subject" (ὑπηγάγετο) of the general—sorting the men (οἱ ἄνδρες) from the boy (παῖς)—and the language of military power is used to exploit social and cultural superiority. The image of an Athenian general on his way to Lesbos to subdue its inhabitants is completed with this final image of the δεξιός poet, one of τῶν χρηστῶν Ἀθηναίων, subduing the Chian wine boy.²⁸ Ion's thumbnail (prose) images of these characters and the peculiar contexts in which he presents them, must arouse our curiosity and beg questions about the kinds of images, metasympotic or otherwise, he privileges in his sympotic *poetry*.

"Wine, dear boy, and truth", as Alcaeus said: οἶνος, ᾧ φίλε παῖ, καὶ ἀλάθεια (fr. 366 Lobel-Page). *Ideally*, "truth" was fundamental to the symposium as a place of instruction to younger participants.²⁹ We

²⁵ On Sophocles *Dexion*, see Connolly (1998). A pun? Gould (1990) 162.

²⁶ Garner (1990) 79.

²⁷ Does this symposium re-present, through the eyes of the omniscient observer—his characterization of the wise poet and the naïve "boy"—a remembered, nostalgic re-configuration of that first, all important, symposium at which Ion met Cimon? Of course, Ion could never be characterized as the same kind of "boy" as the (slave?) boy in this scene. Cf. a lovely boy as the prize for a hymn at Thgn. 993–1002; cf. Ford (2002) 193.

²⁸ χρῆστοί as the "best" Athenians: Dover (1986) 35–6.

²⁹ We note the overtly 'paedagogic' context supplied by the presence of the pedantic *didaskalos* who takes the tragedian/general to task in this sympotic episode. Didactic poetry in symposia offers a specific example of this educative role. See Bremmer (1990) 136ff.; Edmunds (1997) 43 on the Theognidea; and Rösler (1995) 106–12 on the relationship between wine and truth. Cf. Pl. *Laws*, 641c8–d2: "It seems to us, friend, that you are implying that the convivial gathering (ἐν τοῖς οἴνοις), when correctly conducted (ὀρθῶς), is an important element in education (εἰς παιδείας)". As Plutarch

remember that the symposium could function as a forum for intellectual display: surely this cannot have been conducive to the strictest letter of the “truth”. What counted in many a sympotic environment was the ability to present an argument, and its reverse, with facility and *plausibility*.³⁰ In addition, we are dealing with deliberately constructed literary artefacts, products of a society open to “the simultaneous truthfulness of different meanings and modes of reality . . .”³¹ We recall Hesiod’s “lying” Muses: “We know how to say many false things (ψεύδεα πολλὰ), but we know how to tell the truth (ἀληθέα) when we wish to” (*Theog.* 27–8).³²

Within sympotic presentations, we may speculate that the problem of truth or logic is not the primary issue, but persuasion is all.³³ Gorgias’ *Encomium to Helen* is an outstanding example of a sophistic *paignion* and the manipulation of ‘logic’. In a more ‘serious’ fashion, the *Dissoi Logoi* (c. 400) exemplifies the ancient preoccupation with the tension between truth and deception:

ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς τέχνας τρέψομαι καὶ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν. ἐν γὰρ τραγωιδιοποιία καὶ ζωγραφίᾳ ὅστις <κα> πλείστα ἐξαπατῇ ὅμοια τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς ποιέων, οὗτος ἄριστος. (3.10)³⁴

I shall turn to the arts, and to the art of the poets. For in writing tragedy and in painting the one who deceives the most by creating things similar to the truth, he is the best. (tr. Gagarin and Woodruff)

Certainly, the deliberate manipulation of language to suit the moment, or the man, were famously articulated by Thucydides who made it clear

formulates in his discussion on whether one ought philosophize in one’s cups (Εἰ δέῃ φιλοσοφεῖν παρὰ πότον), the purpose of philosophy at the symposium is to instruct and entertain (*Quaest. conv.* 612e–615c). See Schenkeveld (1996); also Relihan (1992) 229. Plutarch, despite his chronological inaccuracies, provides a reasonably veristic picture of fifth/fourth century sympotic processes at work, indicating that the symposium was a place in which to instruct one’s companions. See Pelling (2000) 44ff., 58 on Plutarch as a source.

³⁰ Cf. Détienné (1996) 117–8 on sophistic plausibility; note, too, p. 86 on the “double” nature of logos, both *alethes* and *pseudes*, and the “fundamentally ambivalent” goddess Peitho (pp. 77–8).

³¹ Schlesier (1993) 95. See also Vidal-Naquet in Détienné (1996) 10 (and p. 52).

³² Détienné (1996) 16, 85. Compare Thgn. 713–4: οὐδ’ εἰ ψεύδεα μὲν ποιῶν ἐτόμοισιν ὁμοῖα . . ., “Nor if yet you made lies like true words . . .”

³³ Let me offer but one illuminating instance of this premise at work: if one reads Pseudo-Xenophon’s *Athenaion Politeia* as a sympotic presentation, one can perceive inversions of ‘truths’ expressed in such a manner as to conceal a sub-structure of *actual* ‘truths’: see Katsaros (2001).

³⁴ See Robinson (1979) 184. Note Détienné (1996) 85 on this passage; also p. 107 on Simonides’ “devaluation of Aletheia”.

that there were always choices to be made: "The ordinary acceptance of words in their relation to things was changed as men thought fit" (καὶ τὴν εἰθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιοῦσει: 3.82.4.1–2).

With these *caveats* in mind, let us consider Ion's professed 'rationale' for elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West: αὕτη γὰρ πρόφασις παντοδαπῶν λογίων: "for this is the reason/pretext/theme of 'writers' of every kind". Immediately our Ion is a self-confessed masked man. Clearly, *prophasis* can be a notoriously difficult word to pin down: its shades of semantic meaning are boundless. Given this, whose voice is represented in elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West? Ion has already distanced himself from the poem with the dissociating effect of his prominent nomination of *prophasis*. Whether one interprets this as "theme", as is commonly done, or "alleged reason", or "pretext", the effect is the same: with the masking of his own voice, Ion now has the freedom to speak. First, whatever he is about to say will be diluted by the παντοδαποὶ λογίοι, "writers of every kind" who vouchsafe him the acceptable sympotic mask of *parrhesia*. Incidentally, let us remember, too, that his phrase παντοδαπῶν λογίων is not above suspicion, carrying as it does a kind of smooth inscrutability; and let us also remember that there exists a semantic relationship between *logos* and *logios*. In Plato's *Symposium* 198b1–3, Socrates uses the phrase καλὸν οὕτω καὶ παντοδαπὸν λόγον ῥηθέντα, "such a fine assortment of words", in an ironic sense, and Dinarchus, too, employed the phrase pejoratively (*Dem.* 91.1). And note especially its use by Plato in *Ion*: "and you are a perfect Proteus in the way you take on every kind of shape" (ἀτεχνῶς ὥσπερ ὁ Πρωτεὺς παντοδαπὸς γίγνη: 541e; tr. Lamb). The *logios* himself is "versed in tales or stories . . . hence it is used of chroniclers as opposed to poets"; he is "learned, erudite", "skilled in words, eloquent" (LSJ s.v. *logios*). We also note the more acquiescent, even negative, connotations implied in that most *pantodapos* word *logos*. For example, Herodotus 1.205: Cyrus sends a false *logos* to Queen Tomyrus; we might also compare *Timaeus* 27a where the *logos*, or theory created by Timaeus, was about to be adapted and expanded upon by Critias. Therefore, "myth . . . legend . . . a historical work . . . a speech . . . one of the Gospels . . . and fable" (LSJ s.v. *logos*) are all applicable.³⁵

³⁵ See, for example, Buxton (1999).

Secondly, we take into account “the romantic notion of suspending disbelief”³⁶ which informed the privileged space of the symposium, where memory—after the event—is the enemy: *μισέω μνάμονα συμπότην*, “I hate a drinking companion with a good memory” (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 612c1).

*

Past notions of ‘genre’ have, I suggest, camouflaged the possibility that Ion’s poetry was more than merely a conservative expression of sympotic form and sentiment. Furthermore, an assumed dichotomy between ‘prose’ and ‘truth’/‘verse’ and ‘fiction’ obfuscates our access to this material.³⁷ At the beginning of elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West, however, this preconception becomes immediately suspect. Is not this poet, we recall, also a card-carrying member of these *logioi* “of every kind”?

Thinking about tragedy may facilitate access to texts which apparently lie beyond the immediate scope of this poem. Consider Sophocles’ sympotic stage-managing which enables him to draw the boy’s *prosopon* near. Our poet, like his patron Dionysus (the “multi-masked” god *par excellence*), likes to play games: *πίνειν καὶ παίζειν* . . . (89 Leurini = 26 West, line 16). Let us not forget that our elegist Ion is also a tragedian; it is unlikely that this has “nothing to do with Dionysus”. *πρεσβεύων Διόνυσος/πάτερ Διόνυσε*: after all, elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West (and elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West) is patently Dionysiac in context and content. These texts should not be viewed in isolation. Some remarks by Schlesier are valuable:

On the one hand . . . tragic figures are very clearly defined, at least by their masks, as representing one specific character and nothing else, in any case not a Dionysiac character at all. On the other hand, it sometimes happens that such a character is temporarily mixed up with another kind of character, precisely, a figure that is, terminologically at least, connected with Dionysiac myth and cult. One particular figure is therefore doubled, one might say, by means of another mask . . . But that does not mean that one of these “masks” or roles is less true or less significant than the other. Neither “mask” is a fraud. No truth lies behind them. All the truth

³⁶ Ahl (1984) 196–7.

³⁷ See Détiénne (1996) 193 on the concept of the “histor”: “. . . a witness, one who sees and hears, and, as heir to the *mnemon*, he is also a memorialist. His truth combines at least two components: nonforgetfulness and a complete and exhaustive account of what really happened”.

lies upon the masks and nowhere else. But like the mask, the truth is a double one; it blurs the principle of identity.³⁸

Accordingly, we may understand that Ion's 'voices' offer variations in authorial *persona* and self-positioning.

Metaphor as Riddle

Furthermore, we ought to take note of *context*: note that Athenaeus' recording of Ion's elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West occurs within a discussion of 'what not to say' at a symposium; and is it pure coincidence that it immediately precedes a lengthy discussion of riddles at the symposium (Ath. 448b ff.)? Cherished within the sympotic environment were intelligence and ingenuity, and 'riddling' provided a means of expressing one's aptitude.³⁹ Riddles are intimately linked with the symposium (for example, Antiphanes fr. 122 *PCG*).⁴⁰ Modern anthropologists site the riddle within a context of (masculine) competition—a feature which we know to have been part of the ancient symposium.⁴¹

Riddles . . . play an important role in establishing a person's status and in furthering social development. Riddling often forms a part of highly competitive behaviour in which the aim is to assert power by causing confusion.⁴²

In Aristotle's *Poetics*, riddles are given some generic ancestry as a form of metaphor:

³⁸ Schlesier (1993) 94–5. See, too, Calame (1995) Chapter 4.

³⁹ Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1394a37ff.: the riddle is a pithy comeback, a concise response to a statement that is not paradoxical, but not obviously true. Riddles are relevant to the 'educational' context I briefly noted above. As school-text papyri demonstrate, riddles were part of the school curriculum: Cribiore (1996) 46 (e.g. Catalogue 176, 187, 205). They require some education/skill to set (Stehle 1997: 221), but can prove impenetrable to those who should know the answer—a doctor cannot decipher the cupping-glass riddle (Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 154bc). Is the Eretrian *didaskalos* at sea when faced with a real poet at a literary symposium?

⁴⁰ See Hornblower (2000) 384n58; cf. lyrica adespota 19 ("drink a riddle") or 20 *ap. Collectanea Alexandrina* 191–2; Page (1941) 388–90. The tenth book of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (448b–9b) deals with riddles in a sympotic environment.

⁴¹ In Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 153e–154b, Periander remarks on the long 'history' of intellectual games played when men gather together. For *low* opinions of riddles at symposia see *id.* 154b (with a defence) and *Quaest. conv.* 673a.

⁴² Edwards and Sienkewicz (1990) 179; cf. p. 178: "Another function of riddling is as an informal test of intelligence and personality . . ."

But the greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learnt from others; and it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilars. (1459a5ff; tr. Bywater)⁴³

Aristotle is further relevant:

On the other hand the diction becomes distinguished and non-prosaic by the use of unfamiliar terms, i.e. strange words, metaphors, lengthened forms and everything that deviates from the ordinary modes of speech. But a whole statement in such terms will be either a riddle or a barbarism, a riddle if made up of metaphors, a barbarism if made up of strange words. The very nature indeed of a riddle is this, to describe a fact in an impossible combination of words (which cannot be done with a combination of other names, but can be done with a combination of metaphors); e.g. “I saw a man glue brass on another with fire”, and the like. The corresponding use of strange words results in a barbarism. A certain admixture, accordingly, of unfamiliar terms is necessary. These, the strange word, the metaphor, the ornamental equivalent, etc., will save the language from seeming mean and prosaic, while the ordinary words in it will secure the requisite clearness. (1458a20ff; tr. Bywater)

Riddles could also be expressed in poetic form. I do not mean to suggest that elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West is a riddle *per se*, but I believe it is important to view it *within* this milieu because doing so can illuminate the diverse ways in which mental gymnastics permeated poetic constructs.⁴⁴

Further, let us consider Ion’s uses of this sort of figurative language in elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West. The metaphor which depicts the grapes as the “screaming” children (παῖδες φωνήεντες) of the vine, is not as transparent as it would seem. The image through *prosopopoeia* gives animate qualities—eyes, arms and voice—to the vine and her “densely-packed children” (πυκνοὶ παῖδες). As we know, Ion also wrote a Hymn to the personified abstract Kairos (87 Leurini = 742 PMG = Paus. 5.14.9; see Jennings in this volume) and surely this must make us receptive to the notion that his choices of imagery may possess a potency on levels which have remained unexplored. The manifold interpretations of βοή and, more particularly, of φωνέω, ought to give us cause to think again, in this context, about voices and masked voices. Furthermore, these ‘sounding’ words frame an ominous silence (σιωπῶσιν/πυσάμενοι δὲ βοῆς); and

⁴³ Cf. Ahl (1984) 184–7.

⁴⁴ See, for instance, Stehle (1994) 521; and Power in this volume.

silence is the enemy of sympotic interaction.⁴⁵ Let us consider also the resonance of *πυκνὸν* which is primarily read as “densely-packed”—it is frequently used of foliage. However, when applied to people—and we remember that we are dealing with personification here—it can mean “shrewd” or “wise”. We cannot assume that such poetic messages are necessarily “unintentional”.⁴⁶

And let us remember that Ion’s metaphorical use of ‘vine’ imagery is not isolated. Consider Alcaeus fr. 119 on the vine. Although rather fragmented, enough remains to cause debate. Does this imagery express a political (referring to Pittacus, tyrant of Mytilene) or an amatory disenchantment?

Who . . . your . . . , oh . . . , . . . say . . . provided . . . (accusing?) a guiltless god, when that was wrong; why, (I stopped you) from your folly; come, pay attention to me and stop, and from your evil . . . (restrain?) . . . if you can. For your time has now passed by, and what fruit there was has been gathered, but there is hope that the shoot, since it is a fine one, will bear clusters in plenty—late, however; for I am afraid that the (harvesters?) looking out for . . . bunches from such a vine, will harvest grapes that are unripe and sour. For those who previously toiled . . . ; never . . . ; strong (?) . . . provide welcome . . . (tr. Campbell)

Naturally, the very fact that Alcaeus is *known* to have written political poetry is what facilitates *this* particular spin. However, whether it is either political or amatory (and we have good cause to suspect the former) we are nevertheless looking at a prototype of a metaphor which articulates humans in terms of grapes and the vine.

How came Ion to map *his* particular image? Reading overtly, that is, *only* metasymptotically, we see how neatly this image corresponds to the noise and joviality of the symposium. As Lissarrague notes, even the furniture of the symposium is “linked with music and dance”. Wine-drinking is conducive to noise-making.⁴⁷ However, let us re-read this in a way which the perennial assumption of Ion’s Athenophilia has not encouraged. Chian wine was famous and a commodity of which the Chians were proud.⁴⁸ It is possible that Chian material goods (wine), as well as the Chians’ *proprietary* interest in them, is foregrounded from

⁴⁵ In general, silence is seen as an “abnormal phenomenon”. See Montiglio (2000) 6 and 23 for references. Compare the exchange between Socrates and Callias at Xen. *Symp.* 6.1–3.

⁴⁶ Note Ahl (1984) 195 on figured speech in the rhetoricians.

⁴⁷ Lissarrague (1990) 36.

⁴⁸ On the Chian wine trade, see Sarikakis (1986).

the very outset in this symposium context. Ion's reputation as a lover of 'drink' (94 Leurini = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41), which has followed him down the centuries, is not, as such, under scrutiny here, but certainly it has tended to exclude further investigation into this image. Within such a highly ritualized literary construct, is it possible to convey, through figured speech, covert messages of dissent which co-exist within the more conventional?⁴⁹ Consider the (possibly apocryphal) anecdote concerning Ion's donation of Chian wine on his victory at the Dionysia at Athens (T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f = *Suda* α 731; and T8 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T2b, T3 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835).⁵⁰ West suggests that this tale is a scholiast's misinterpretation, and should rather be read with metaphorical resonance: that is, the "good draught of Chian wine" with which the Athenians were presented was, in fact, the work/s of Ion himself.⁵¹ Let us expand on this: consider the possibility that the grapes, the "children" of Chios, home-grown in the land which produced them (αὐτοφύες) are, metaphorically, the Chians themselves.⁵² "Eyes", by transference, could also be the "dearest" or the "best" and, as the most precious part of the body, hence, could be used of men (LSJ s.v. *ophthalmos* IV).⁵³ Were the vine and her children therefore the "dearest" of the Chians? As such, are they exploitable in all senses: "milked" (ἀμέλγονται) culturally, literally and metaphorically of their nectar? The verb ἀμέλγειν is used of milking animals (LSJ s.v.), but it can also be used metaphorically. Note Aristophanes' pejorative use at *Knights* 326, where the Chorus describes the Paphlagonian's "draining" (ἀμέλγει) the "fruits" (τοὺς καρπίμους) of the foreigners (τῶν ξένων).⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Ahl (1984) 187: the figured speaker "... is safe because the critical links in thought must be established by his reader or listener: the text is incomplete until the audience completes the meaning".

⁵⁰ See Stevens in this volume on this anecdote. Ion's apparent delight in winning and making such a donation ought not necessarily be viewed as a 'pro-Athenian' gesture *per se*: perhaps it was simply the action of a man gobsmacked with delight!

⁵¹ West (1985) 73.

⁵² Are the αὐτοφύες Chians here implicitly contrasted with the autochthonous Athenians? In line 4 the stem of the primordial (panhellenic?) vine is ὑποχθόνιον.

⁵³ On this metaphor, see also Clarke in this volume.

⁵⁴ But see, too, Neil (1901) 52n326 who explains the emendation to ἀμέργεις: "you strip"; see, too, Neil on the sense of the "harassing of the rich" and a plausible reference to allied cities in connection with the tribute. Henderson (1998) 271; Sommerstein (1981) 160–1: "according to the scholia the Greek verb is properly used of thieves taking fruit from trees". Whichever emendation one accepts, the pejorative sense nevertheless remains.

The crushing of the grapes is generally taken as a “blessed toil for all men”, *πόνον ὄλβιον ἀνθρώποισιν*.⁵⁵ The blessed afterlife of these “milked” grapes—their *μόνος/πόνος*—becomes the antidote to the *πόνος* afflicting mankind.⁵⁶ When pressured, it becomes (characteristically) difficult to take this phrase at its face value.⁵⁷ It is interesting, too, for the textual difficulty of line 13, that West suggests that Ion “is more likely to have used a polar expression such as *τῶν τε πονηρῶν/τῶν τ' ἀγαθῶν*”.⁵⁸ This suggestion provides a credible echo of Ion's earlier use of *πόνον ὄλβιον*, if this is how we choose to read it. Furthermore, the grapes are described as *φάρμακον αὐτοφύεξ*. Ion's use of *φάρμακον*, is, once again, pregnant with semantic resonance. A *φάρμακον* could be a good or a bad thing: a “poison” or an “antidote”, as we well recall from Helen's ‘mickey finn’ at *Odyssey* 4.219ff.⁵⁹ Ion may well have been using the word with ambiguous intertextual intent, given the benefits or disadvantages of wine consumption, depending on the amount and type and strength consumed.⁶⁰

The Eyes of the Symposium

In addition, I suggest that the image of the grapes—the children from the “eyes” (*ὀφθαλμῶν*)⁶¹ of the vine—operates on other levels. Sympotic

⁵⁵ For the connection between *ponos* and *poneros*, see Neil (1901) 206–7: “The social and political use of *πονηρός* and *μοχθηρός* as opposed to *καλὸς κάγαθός* or *χρηστός* appears chiefly from 430 to 350 BC. It may be connected with *πόνος*, *πένομαι* as ‘working-class’ . . . and *πόνω* *πονηρός* was a kind of superlative . . . It seems to have been specially Attic . . . The use is nowhere so clear as in the ‘Old Oligarch’s’ *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* . . .” Neil observes (p. 207) that, “the word could be easily retorted on the party which claimed for itself the words *χρηστός* or *καλὸς κάγαθός*. This retort-use we find in such cases as *Wasps* 446 where the chorus calls Bdelycleon *ὦ πόνω πόνηρε καὶ κομηταμυνία* . . .” *Olbios*: Dionysiac connotations of *olbios* are intriguing, given those nebulous ideas with which Ion was allegedly familiar. See Baltussen or Jennings in this volume; see Graf (1993) 246–7; Nagy (1990a) 244–6.

⁵⁶ The ‘generic’ *ἀνθρώποισιν* may be contrasted with the more specific garlanded *ἀνδράσιν*, in the same way in which the generic *πανελλήνων* is contrasted with the nebulous oppressed ‘Other’.

⁵⁷ Meineke emended *μόνον* (codd.) to *πόνον*, accepted by West. Leurini prints *μόνον*—the sole blessed (thing) for mankind. The reading, nevertheless, can be pressured: the draining of the grapes is still analogous to deprivation. See Leurini (2000a) *ad loc.*

⁵⁸ West (1974) 173.

⁵⁹ This concept prevails within many prose and poetic constructs: Alcaeus fr. 335; Hdt. 1.212; Pl. *Laws* 666a8–c2.

⁶⁰ See Lissarrague (1990) 6–7; Teğusan (1990) 249.

⁶¹ The buds of the vine are its “eyes”. We note the apposition of “eyes” is well attested in the ancient world. Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 2.10, 3.20, 6.16; *Pyth.* 4.120, 5.18; *Nem.* 10.90.

material culture offers wine cups with eyes in their centres:⁶² we know that there was much metaphorical interplay between this material culture and the actual activities of the symposium.⁶³ Is not the extension of this into poetic constructs only natural? *Prima facie*, then, this image operates on both metasympotic and metaphorical levels: we remember that the symposium was an occasion where one *was* watched, and one watched. Note that even the “wine inspectors”, who apportioned the wine and provided lamps and wicks for the guests were known as the “eyes” (Ath. 425b4). Individuals were on display, and, as such, within the limits of a formalized environment, open to criticism or derision: indeed, the humiliation of the Eretrian *didaskalos* in *Epidemiai* affords an example of this kind of experience.⁶⁴ Watching, being watched, listening and being heard, with all the attendant consequences (good or bad reception of one’s performance and behaviour), all formed a part of sympotic participation. Alcaeus once again affords a pertinent *gnome*: “for wine is a peep-hole into man” (οἶνος γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ δίοπτρον: fr. 333; tr. Campbell). Ion’s interest in relating instances of personalized ‘biography’, which mute his own active presence, consequently reinforces our picture of him as an observer.

Leadership Terms

There are other features of this elegy which are at odds with any assumption that a superficial reading is all that is required. Murray, in his ‘archaeology’ of the symposium, sees the origin of sympotic behaviour as follows: any martial society is highly dependent on the maintenance of unity; thus he and others restore these male orientated organizations to a central position in classical Greek society.⁶⁵ Similarly, Bremmer suggests that the “symposion was the successor of the common meal of

⁶² Lissarrague (1990) 143: “That the eye is put through such a play of metamorphoses will come as no surprise. The vase painters are working in a setting in which wine, music and image are complementary and, in their ties to one another, form a whole web of interrelations; at every level, metaphors and metamorphoses grow under the spell of Dionysus, master of illusion”. Cf. Frontisi-Ducroux (1989).

⁶³ Lissarrague (1990) 47–8.

⁶⁴ The attendant humiliation could be dulled by wine: we remember that, in this sense, Plato, recognizing that fear of failure is a powerful stimulant, refers to the symposium as φάρμακον φόβου: *Laws* 647e–8a. See Pellizer (1990) 183 on Plato’s “organic definition of the status and social functions of the *symposion*”.

⁶⁵ Murray (1991) especially pp. 92–4.

the archaic warrior clubs".⁶⁶ As a general observation, this is plausible, and Ion's uses of παν- compounds can be read as reinforcing this. Let us further consider Ion's use of πανελλήνων ἀγοραὶ. Elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West begins with an address to Dionysus (μέγα πρεσβεύων Διόνυσος), and ends similarly (πάτερ Διόνυσε . . . συμποσίων πρύτανι . . .).⁶⁷ While these terms are not unusual in sympotic literature,⁶⁸ and we note that both aristocratic and democratic terms are present, the particular occurrences here demand further attention. Might these expressions of contemporary political organization have a deeper significance? Can we read them as alluding to *actual* political control, and, if so, to what manner of political control? Does Ion suggest, by these terms, a microcosmic allusion to a macrocosmic reality? To what extent is a deliberate selection of these particular words a part of our 'masked' author's cultural and political self-positioning?

Let us note that these terms of (essentially) political control precisely envelop (a ring composition?) the metaphor of the children of the vine. The primary meaning of ἀγοραὶ is that of *political* assembly (LSJ s.v. *agora* I). We note the absolute central position of this word in the line, which reflects the absolute centrality of the agora itself within democratic, civic space.⁶⁹ Could we also read the transition from πανελλήνων, at the beginning of the line, to ἀνάκτων at its very end as providing an effect akin to *paraprosdokian* upon its listeners? ἄναξ is also used of a master as opposed to a slave: again, it is possible to detect a different shade of meaning (LSJ s.v. *anax* III). A similar effect might be achieved by the juxtaposition φάρμακον αὐτοφνέξ at the end of line 10 (see below). The broad brushstrokes of the two παν- compounds then give way to the rarified and aristocratic world of these "princes".⁷⁰

The primary meaning of πρύτανις is similarly associated with *political* office⁷¹ and we note the cumulative effect—akin to that of a hymn⁷²—of the (singular) terms of authority which frame the plurals and finally

⁶⁶ Bremmer (1990) 136.

⁶⁷ The line preceding is unmetrical—was it Athenaeus' or Ion's? Likely Ion's, but this is open to conjecture.

⁶⁸ Pellizer (1990) 178.

⁶⁹ Steiner (1994) 180–93; Vernant (1983) 188, 214.

⁷⁰ Do we perceive a further contraction from παν- to ἄναξ to βασιλεὺς—the *only* king? The repetition of θαλία line 11 echoing line 3 may mark out the repetition as noteworthy.

⁷¹ Cf. 86* Leurini = 744 PMG = Ath. 35de.

⁷² Cf. Bartol (2000) 190 and n22.

return us to our initial *πρεσβέων Διόνυσος* of the introduction. The final epithet *ἐπιήρανε* has always been accepted as meaning “helper”, but it also has a secondary meaning of “ruling”.⁷³ Consider, too, the conscious archaism of *ἀνάκτων* which transports the symposiasts back in time and recalls Homeric society; it is also a device which could add solemnity to the occasion; and we note that *wanax* was particularly used of Apollo who was one of the gods to whom one sang the hymn—in Apollo’s case, the paean—at the beginning of a symposium. Ion calls wine *ξυνὸν τοῦ χαίρειν φάρμακον αὐτοφυές* provided (supplied line 1) by Dionysus who is “King Wine” and “showed up the nature of good men”: *τῶν ἀγαθῶν <...> βασιλεὺς οἶνος ἔδειξε φύσιν*.

We have already considered similar gnomic sentiments in Alcaeus’ work on wine and truth, and wine as a peephole into man. Such adages also occur in the Theognidea (at 500) as well as in Athenaeus, particularly in 35a–40f. Sententious remarks have a “compelling effect . . . creating a speech event the Greeks found worth preserving in memory for its embodiment of some key cultural value”.⁷⁴ As Russo adds, “The speaker momentarily ceases to use a personal voice in the here and now and instead uses the voice of the shared cultural tradition”. By “invoking the authority of cultural norms”, Ion assumes another mask—one which allows him “to impress the validity of his viewpoint on his addressee”.⁷⁵ We see that Chian “wine”, the “home-grown” *φάρμακον*, product of the earthy Chian mother and the kingly Dionysiac *pater*, possesses the ultimate (“lifelong”, *αἰῶνα*) power over those it rules: it will expose “good men” and “just thoughts”. Extrapolating the metaphor back to the secondary connotations explored above (grapes ~ Chians) raises some very interesting questions indeed about Ion’s vision for Chios’ (autonomous?) place in the world.

⁷³ In line 15, consider the alleged echo of Empedocles 31B129.3 DK on Pythagoras (*σοφῶν ἐπιήρανος ἔργων*), noted by Dover (1986). On this see also Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1927) 281–2 (“*was warhlich ein unerwartetes Lob dieses Gottes ist*”) and Dover (1986) 30–1 for further discussion of Ion’s possible “irreverence in adapting a phrase used of Pythagoras in praising a god who is the giver of ‘drink and fun’”.

⁷⁴ Russo (1997) 50.

⁷⁵ Russo (1997) 53.

Dike: *Real or Imagined?*

One of the enduring preoccupations of the classical world was δίκη.⁷⁶ In this, Ion appears to be no exception. In philosophical and historical works,⁷⁷ sophistry⁷⁸ and oratory, δίκη is often discussed in opposition to advantage; it is not confined, however, to prose media, but is embedded in contextually 'sympotic' poetic texts from the sixth century. For example, we note again Xenophanes' elegy 21B1 DK, lines 15–16: σπείσαντάς τε καὶ εὐξαμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι / πρήσσειν - ταῦτα γὰρ ὧν ἔστι προχειρότερον . . ., "when they have made libation and prayed for power to do what is right . . ." (tr. Edmonds). Similarly, in the so-called Berlin papyrus,⁷⁹ although mention of δίκη *per se* is absent, we nevertheless see the same themes at work: γελᾶν παίζειν (to laugh, to play) is balanced by ἡ δὲ σπουδὴ ἐπέσθω (but let seriousness follow). 'Order' becomes foregrounded—ἡ δ' ἀρετὴ συμποσίου πέλεται: "this is the good symposium". The final line of Ion's elegy, πίνειν καὶ παίζειν καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν appears to conform to this focus on δίκη, fulfilling this prerequisite for a "good" symposium, as his final exhortation to the symposiasts is necessarily directed towards δίκαια. Moderation and *balance* between drinking and playing is off-set by the acknowledgement of τὰ δίκαια. We see the limits set between laughter and seriousness—a balance which became the norm in sympotic prose texts too.⁸⁰ As Slater observes, "The mood desired was one dominated

⁷⁶ See, for example, Decleva Caizzi (1999).

⁷⁷ For example, Diodotus' speech at Thuc. 3.47.5. See Finley (1938) 50: "... it is noteworthy that Diodotus opposes Cleon's position of rigid justice with the same cool arguments from the laws of nature and from personal profit with which the Nurse in the *Hippolytus* (433–481, 500–502) disputes Phaedra's more idealistic stand. This practice of refuting τὸ δίκαιον by τὸ συμφέρον seems to have been well known, and the debate between Phaedra and the Nurse makes it quite certain that such tactics were familiar in the Athens of Cleon and Diodotus". Cf., also, Finley (1939) 51.

⁷⁸ For example, *Dissoi Logoi* 3 (90 DK: Περὶ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου). Cross-pollination of sophistic ideas resulted in their expression in different 'genres', as is illustrated by 87B44c DK, col. 1.1–30 where Antiphon (the sophist) applies the concept of "justice" and "injustice" to a forensic context (it is little wonder that this type of cross-pollination has not allowed an end to the debate over one Antiphon or two).

⁷⁹ Adesp. eleg. fr. 27 West, line 8.

⁸⁰ Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 197de: Agathon's speech, while a parody of Gorgianic style, reveals more than simply a list of rhetorical devices: τὰ μὲν παιδιᾶς, τὰ δὲ σπουδῆς; he is acknowledging the traditional sympotic custom decreeing a balance between levity and gravity, and mirroring the cornerstones of politic behaviour. Cf. Thgn. 479–81: "whoever exceeds his limit of drink is no longer in command of his tongue or his

by *Charis* and *Euphrosyne*, governed by *Dike*, the whole conditioned by *Eunomia* and opposed to violence”.⁸¹

The symposium often appears to function as a microcosm of the polis—governed by ethical constraints (the ἀρετὴ συμποσίου) expressed in the language of the polis.⁸² These varied examples all offer the kinds of common themes which sought a mood conducive to the sympotic environment. A fundamental issue in sympotic literature is the balance struck between drinking/playing and one’s obligation to δίκη. In Ion’s poem, the limits are set between γέλ-/σπουδ-, and governed by δίκη. Given that Ion’s poem so neatly conforms to the basics that might be required of a sympotic elegy, there is once again cause to question whether the employment of conventional literary/political values also guarantee our Chian his mask of *parrhesia*. If we read this elegy in the light of all that has been discussed above, it is possible that Ion’s final words καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν was his slam-dunk. Where was all that “justice” in the lot of the Chians, those “allies” of Athens?

*

Reflections on all of the above can offer valuable insights into Ion’s Ionian ‘mindset’ as well as his poetic output. Past readings which have approached his texts within their conventional ‘generic’ isolation, obscure much simply because they dislocate. On the other hand, re-reading his works as inextricably related can offer very different perspectives which aid and develop our understanding of this polymath and his work.

mind: he says wild things in the eyes of the sober, and he is not ashamed of anything he does when he is drunk”.

⁸¹ Slater (1981) 208; cf. Ford (2002) Chapter 1. On “upper-class, sympotic, *hubris*” and *euphrosune* see Fisher (1990) 128–9, 135; Murray (1990c) 139–40, 142–3.

⁸² See Seng (1988); Murray (1990c) 142–3, 145; Bowie (1997) 3–11.

PART FOUR

ION THE TRAGEDIAN

CHAPTER TWELVE

ION OF CHIOS: TRAGEDY AS COMMODITY AT THE ATHENIAN EXCHANGE

ALEXANDER STEVENS

Introduction

At a date somewhere between 450 and the late 420s BC, we are told that a foreign poet won a tragic victory in Athens and celebrated this success in a remarkable way.¹ It is said that this poet, presumably a wealthy man, did not confine his celebrations among his friends and connections alone, but instead distributed jars of wine to the Athenian people at large. Now, biographical tit-bits such as these are difficult to verify. This foreign poet was himself responsible for an emerging genre featuring autobiographical encounters with famous Greeks, and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that this story originated with the poet himself.² But, if we were to accept the anecdote as reflecting some reality, how should we understand such a donation?

At the most obvious level, we might suppose that the poet sought in this concrete fashion to involve the entire city in his victory symposium.³ Perhaps in doing so he was trying to eschew any of the elitist overtones that could have attended this sort of victory-party; we might even speculate that the poet was attempting instead to emphasize the pro-Athenian, conspicuously democratic credentials of himself and his family.⁴ In any case, this poet was certainly later known for his interest in wine;

¹ T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f and T8 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 (cf. T2b) = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; the two versions of the anecdote are not entirely consistent.

² Emerging genre: on Ion's *Epidemiai* see Jacoby (1947a); Huxley (1965) 31; Momigliano (1993) 29–33; Piccirilli (1998) 147–50. Poets' biographies: Fairweather (1974); Lefkowitz (1981); Graziosi (2002); Scullion (2003). A pessimistic view of Ion's anecdotes: Lefkowitz (1981) 67–8, 80–2.

³ Compare Wilson (2000a) 252 on the self-declared status of ceramics marking choral victories.

⁴ For an exclusive victory-party early in 416 BC, in honour of Agathon's first tragic victory, compare Plato's *Symposium*. These parties, τὰ ἐπινίκια, were hosted by the *choregos*: for the evidence and their potentially “rather ‘undemocratic’ character”, see Wilson

the biographical tradition goes so far as to depict him as something of a drunk.⁵ But in any case, this choice of gift ought not be understood only within a personal frame. First, the poet in question was from Chios and wine was *the* Chian product. Secondly, Chian wine was not just any wine, but wine of the highest quality.⁶ Arguably it had held this status since Homeric times when the resourceful Odysseus used the superlative product of Maron's vine to befuddle the Cyclops Polyphemus—the eponymous Maroneia was the earliest colony founded from Chios and their respective associations with wine are surely connected.⁷ With these considerations in mind, this wine ought not be viewed simply as a gift from a bibulous poet. Instead, we would have to recognize its symbolic value as a characteristic Chian prestige commodity, a literal counterpart to the prestigious tragic competition in which the Chian poet had just participated, a competition that was one of the most characteristically Athenian institutions. This poet, if the anecdote has any historical validity, was marking his victory in this most famous of Athenian dramatic competitions as *Ion of Chios*.

Let us step back for a moment from this allegedly vinous victory. Scholarship of the last thirty years has repeatedly underlined how the performance of tragedy in Athens was bound up in the institutions and politics of the city.⁸ We understand, if not without some caveats, how tragic performance provided a means for the city to examine itself and others through various diffracting prisms, and in particular through stories of archetypal problematic individuals, families and polities drawn from a sizeable heritage of legendary tales, including the great traditions of poetry about Heracles, Thebes and Troy. We are also familiar with the cultural hegemony of Athenian drama that subsequently exported

(2000a) 102–3. Ion's son was put to death for *attikismos* in Chios in 412 BC during an anti-Athenian revolt: T14 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T7 = Thuc. 8.38.3.

⁵ 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f (reporting Baton of Sinope); Ael. *VH* 2.41: ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἰωνος τοῦ ποιητοῦ φιλοπότην φησὶ γενέσθαι καὶ ἐρωτικώτατον τὸν Ἰωνα. Baton (a New Comedy poet): Hunter (1997) 45n11.

⁶ See, for example, Hermippus fr. 82.5 *PCG* = Ath. 29e, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 470f; Sarikakis (1986) 122–3; Dalby (2000).

⁷ Hom. *Od.* 9.196–8; cf. *Il.* 9.71–2, Archil. fr. 2 West; also on a fourth century Sicilian calyx-krater (*LCS Suppl.* III 275 no. 46g, Lipari inv. 2297): Trendall and Webster (1971) III.6, 2. For the connections, see Barron (1986) 94; Roebuck (1986) 82–3; Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) on *Od.* 9.197–8.

⁸ The Athenian-ness of the Great Dionysia in particular has been discussed at length: see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 57–69; Goldhill (1990); Griffith (1995); Friedrich (1996), especially pp. 263–5; Griffin (1998); Seaford (2000).

this tragic poetry as a virtual commodity throughout greater Greece, and beyond, during the fourth century and later.⁹ Indeed, a recent focus of scholarly attention has also been how far this “Athenian” tragedy had spread its wings through Greece already during the fifth century.¹⁰ Against this scholarly backdrop, then, the tragic success of Ion of Chios on the Athenian stage provides an opportunity to sound out these interpretative frameworks in a very specific way. In the tragic fragments of Ion, we are given a glimpse into the activities of a *foreign* tragedian in Athens during a time when Athenian tragedy, though still a largely Athenian genre, was in the midst of a period of artistic innovation and experimentation that led to its subsequent spread across the Greek world. For although foreign poets are regularly attested within the bounds of the dithyrambic competitions at Athens (and foreign *aulos*-players), there are relatively few foreign tragedians competing at Athens in the fifth century.¹¹ Ion is still something of an exception within the larger frame of Athenian tragic competition.

Against this larger backdrop, our little tale of a poet gifting the Athenian public with expensive largesse contributes a stimulating gloss on Ion’s victory. Whether we accept it as an historical incident or not, this anecdote presents a distinctive take on Ion’s victory: the prestige of tragic victory, won through the successful creation and consumption of tragic drama, an Athenian product *par excellence*, is answered in turn with the material benefits of a distinctively Chian product, namely the gifting and consumption of expensive wine. Ion the Chian poet and *bon viveur* offers first his tragedy and then his wine in return for the literary approbation of the Athenian people, the patrons of and performers in their tragic festivals conducted under the aegis of Dionysus.¹² In short,

⁹ The development of drama as commodity is evidenced not least by vase painting: see Trendall and Webster (1971); Green (1991); Trendall (1991); Taplin (1993); Green (1994) 16–88; Taplin (1999) 39–41; Allan (2001). On the relationship between fifth and fourth century tragedy, see especially Easterling (1993). See Csapo and Miller (1998) 114–5 for the nexus of Greek democracy and artistic innovation.

¹⁰ See especially Taplin (1999); Allan (2001).

¹¹ On these contrasts, see Wilson (1999) 76–8 and (2000a) 63–4. Foreign tragedians at Athens in the fifth and fourth century: Taplin (1999) 35. In the dithyrambic contests, a foreign *auletes* could be a source of prestige for a *choregos*: Wilson (1999) 74n62.

¹² By contrast with tragedy and comedy, dithyrambic competition quite commonly featured non-Athenian poets: see Wilson (2000a) 63–4, especially p. 64: “It is not often stressed how regularly these foreign poets and their associated musicians worked in Athens with and for the Athenian *phylai* at a festival so important for Athenian civic consciousness and identity”.

this foreign poet's participation in the Athenian tragic festival is framed in terms of an exchange.

To this extent, the anecdote is not simply a biographical tit-bit to be noted, questioned, and at any rate simply dismissed or passed over. It is instead a story which proffers a distinctive gloss on the symbolic operations of the Athenian tragic festivals. Where did the story originate? We cannot be sure. But we can still make some use of its take on Ion's victory, which gives readers of Ion's fragments a structuring frame within which to press the meagre leavings of Ion's tragic output. Two issues are focuses in this frame: first, the broad question of Ion's participation in a fifth century culture of creative contact and exchange as evidenced by his tragic productions; and, second, the more specific question of what it might have meant to participate as a foreigner in the Athenian tragic competitions. These are the issues that underpin this paper, as we confront the piecemeal task of examining what can be read from Ion's tragic fragments.

Ion's Literary Output

In antiquity Ion was famed for his πολυειδεία.¹³ Although he is most commonly called ὁ Χίος, generic designations also abound: Ion is τραγικός, λυρικός, φιλόσοφος, παλαιὸς σοφιστής, more generally ποιητής, and even συγγραφεύς.¹⁴ Genres attributed to him include (in verse) dithyramb, tragedy, lyric, comedy, epigrams, paeans, hymns, scolia, encomia, elegy, and (in prose) philosophy, history and biographical anecdotes.¹⁵ I do not propose to rehearse this material, but one negative observation is pertinent. For all Ion's generic profligacy—one scholiast even grants Ion the supposedly impossible pairing of tragedy and comedy—he is not attested as venturing upon *epos*, which was, of course, the one form of poetry with which Chios had long been associated.¹⁶

¹³ Application of the term to Ion: T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* 9.32–38 in Callim. *Iamb.* 13 (fr. 203 Pfeiffer); see Pfeiffer (1949) 205. Such “generic diversity” can be paralleled in the fifth century; for example, in the controversial figure of Critias: see Wilson (2003) 195.

¹⁴ See Fowler (2000) 258.

¹⁵ This list is given by T8 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T2b = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835.

¹⁶ Tragedy and comedy: see Pl. *Symp.* 223d, and Taplin (1986) 163 with n1. On Chios and epic see *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 172: τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνι παρπαλοέσσει (quoted by Thuc. 3.104.4–6); Simon. fr. 19.1 West: Χίος . . . ἀνὴρ; Theoc. 7.47–8: Χίον

Even Ion's *Chiou Ktisis*, whose title has at times appeared to designate an affiliation with a long-lasting genre of hexameter poetry centred on particular localities and their stories, is most likely a prose treatise, a συγγραφή (98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8–10).¹⁷

Nonetheless, and notwithstanding this avoidance of epic composition, we can discern from what remains of Ion's tragic output something that we would have assumed in any case, namely that epic poetry was a vital part of Ion's cultural world.¹⁸ First, there are several tragedies whose subject-matter is apparently drawn from earlier hexameter poetry. Second, what little can be discerned from these fragments allows us to say that Ion, like his contemporaries among the Athenian tragedians, confronted epic as a source which offered not only a coherent set of narratives and narrative frames, but also pointed the way towards interesting cracks in its own narratives that might be further teased out in provocative dramatic forms.

A general dependence upon epic narrative as a source is evident from the scattered surviving titles of Ion's plays. In schematic terms, these

ᾠοιδόν (cf. Hunter 1999 on 7.47–8: “indeed the suggestion may be that there can only ever be one Chian poet”). For a speculative reflection on the Chian Homeridai and competition over the Homeric texts, see Scodel (2002) 58–61.

¹⁷ For Ion's *Chiou Ktisis* in prose, not hexameters (or elegiacs), see Jacoby (1947a) 4–5; Huxley (1965) 35; Lesky (1966) 410; Dover (1986) 32; Fowler (2000) 262. An explicit defence in favour of an elegiac *Foundation of Chios* is mounted in vain by Cerri (1977). Dougherty (1994) 41n38—curiously, given the rest of her argument—follows von Blumenthal (1939) in identifying this as an elegy. Attestations of “local epics”, namely hexameter poetry on local historical and mythological themes, are numerous enough if not always secure: West (2002) 109, a “crepuscular fraternity”. Dougherty (1994) systematically doubts the early evidence for verse foundation poems. In the archaic period: a *Corinthiaka* by Eumelos—Jacoby (1949) 219; Davies (1988) 96–101; West (2002) 118–26; a *Foundation of Colophon* (*Kolophonos ktisis*) and *Colonization of Elea in Italy* in two thousand hexameters by Xenophanes: D. L. 9.20; Dougherty (1994) 39–40; but Jacoby (1947a) 4n6 (though see Jacoby 1949: 184 and 363n62—“perhaps such a poem is possible”) and Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983) 165–6 are sceptical; the *Phoronis* (a collection of Argive myths): Davies (1988) 153–5; a *Naupactia*: Davies (1988) 145–9; the *Phokais*: Davies (1988) 153; the *Thesprotis*: Pausanias 8.12.5, though Davies (1988) 73 and 156 attributes this to the *Telegonia*; the *Meropis*: *SH* 903A (for the date see Lloyd-Jones 1990a); an *Atthis* by Hegesinous: Paus. 9.29.1—but see Jacoby (1949) 219 and Davies (1988) 166. In the fifth century: the *Persika* of Choirilos of Samos: Huxley (1969); Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983) 146–53; an Ἴωνικά ἐν πεντομέτρῳ by Panyassis: Davies (1988) 113; Dougherty (1994) 40. In the Hellenistic period see, for example, the *ktiseis* of Alexandria, Kaunos, Knidos, Naucratis, Rhodes and Lesbos by Apollonius of Rhodes: *CA* 4–12; and for a lengthy list of authors and titles, see Lloyd-Jones (1990a) 25–6.

¹⁸ Ion had a son named Tydeus, an interestingly heroic name: see Barron (1986) 101–2.

plays deal with two sets of subject matter, both of which are familiar from epic sources, namely stories about Heracles and the story of the war at Troy. Eleven play titles are attested. Stories connected with the figure of Heracles must have provided the framework for *Alcmene*, the *Eurytidai*, and the satyric *Omphale*.¹⁹ Similarly, stories from the Trojan War evidently constituted the material for *Agamemnon*, *Laertes*, *Teukros*, and *Phrouroi*. Of these seven plays, the satyric *Omphale* has been favoured with the largest amount of subsequent quotation, but I will not focus on the fragments of this satyric play here.²⁰ The other six of this seven survive in quotations whose size ranges from a single word up to four connected lines. It is a meagre crop, but at least the titles permit a partial identification of the plays' general subjects. This paper will focus on several fragments from these six plays in detail for what light they may cast on Ion's activity as a tragic playwright.

Four titles remain of the eleven. These titles are accompanied, like the others, by a pitifully meagre harvest of iambic lines or lyric cola, but fundamental difficulties remain in identifying even their basic subject-matter. *Argeioi* could be connected with Trojan material since there was an Argive contingent at Troy, but the heroes Diomedes, Sthenelus and Euryalus were also part of the assault of the Epigonoι on Thebes: this narrative is mentioned in the Homeric poems and was the subject of epic in its own right, not to mention a range of other fifth century tragedies.²¹ The *Mega Drama* is an oddity about which it is difficult to say even a little.²² The second *Phoenix* appears to be connected with the story of Troy in some way, but another *Phoenix* complicates matters: an attested alternative title for this *Phoenix*, namely *Kaineus*, presents stark difficulties of mythological coherence and the fact that there are three

¹⁹ The mythological *personae*: Alcmene, see Gantz (1993) 1.374–8; Eurytus and his sons, see Gantz (1993) 1.434–7; Omphale, see Gantz (1993) 1.439–40. Relevant epic predecessors dealing with Heracles: the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and *Aspis*, the *Conquest of Oechalia*, the *Herakleia* of Pisander, and, in the fifth century, the *Herakleia* of Panyassis.

²⁰ See Easterling and Maitland in this volume. The vocabulary of this play was drawn upon by Callimachus in the *Hekale*: see fr. 233, 242, 342 Pfeiffer. Aristarchus may have written a commentary on this play: see T26 Leurini = Ath. 634c and the cautious comments of Pfeiffer (1968) 223; certainly Ion's plays were the subject of scholarly attention in antiquity: see Fowler (2000) 261 on test. 9.

²¹ Argives at Troy: Hom. *Il.* 2.559–68; Sthenelos recalls their exploits: *Il.* 4.404–10. The Epigonoι: Gantz (1993) 2.522–4. Relevant epic predecessors: the *Epigonoι*, the *Alkmaionis*. Both Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote an *Epigonoι*.

²² 19 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F15 = Pollux 10.177; 20 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F16 = Hsch. μ 621; 21 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17 = Hsch. ο 922.

plays called *Phoenix* simply adds to the problem.²³ The fragments of these five plays are themselves usually of little help in confronting these difficulties. For instance, the most substantial fragments from *Phoenix/Kaineus* offer only gnomic rejections of the hedgehog and the octopus as models of self-defence.²⁴ And the citation contexts for these book fragments—for all of the fragments of Ion's tragedies have survived in this frustrating form—are typically uninformative, and we are left to guess at possible dramatic contexts: for these proverbial sentiments from *Phoenix*, the speech of an Achilles or Phoenix or even Chiron would do, but it is difficult to build on such speculation.²⁵ Lack of context bedevils the interpretation of nearly all the fragments of Ion's tragedies, and this situation has understandably led to declarations of despair.²⁶ Still, what can positively be said about these remaining four plays does not overturn the basic proposition that Ion's plays, as much as we know of them, focused on Heracles and the story of the war at Troy, with the one probable exception of *Argeioi*.

Despite this unpromising introduction, the cup is not entirely dry. One play among these scattered remnants is capable of being discussed in a little more narrative detail. Through a happy coincidence first noticed by Welcker between one of Ion's book fragments and a detail in Proclus' summary of the cyclic epic poem the *Little Iliad*, the basic plot-scenario of Ion's *Phrouroi* can be identified. And Ion's *Phrouroi* will be my focus in the following section for several reasons. First, it deals with a provocative part of the story of the Trojan War that is explicitly raised as such already in the fourth book of the Homeric *Odyssey*. Second, it features characters who functioned as touchstones of reflection about poetry and its production from Homer onwards. Third, the meagre fragments that survive offer a convenient starting point to consider briefly a stylistic aspect of Ion's tragic poetry. In what follows it will be profitable to read the fragments boldly: the provisional nature of the conclusions that result is a necessary price to pay.

²³ See the brief comments on the title by Snell (1971a) 105.

²⁴ 44 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F38 = Ath. 91d; 45 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F36 = Ath. 318e.

²⁵ Problems of book-fragments: see, recently, Collard *et al.* (1995) 2; Dover (2000); Arnott (2000) 1–4. Proverb: cf. Archil. fr. 126 West (66D) and Pind. fr. 43 Snell-Maehler. Possible *personae*: see Snell on *TrGF* 19 F36.

²⁶ Cf. Diehl (1916) 1866: “Die Rekonstruktion . . . ist infolge der Dürftigkeit der Fragmente ausgeschlossen”.

The Phrouroi

At first sight, the fragments of *Phrouroi* are at least as unpromising as Ion's other fragmentary plays. The total harvest of book fragments includes four whole iambic lines, all unconnected, and a handful of phrases and words that proved to be of interest to later Greek lexicographers. But with the help of a scholiast on Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Welcker made a persuasive connection between this play and an incident recounted in Proclus' summary of the Cyclic *Little Iliad*. At some point in the play the following line was spoken (53 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F44 = Ar. *Frogs* 1425 and Schol.; Suda σ 371):

σιγᾶ μέν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται γε μὴν

[she?] is silent, but hates [him? the situation?], and wishes moreover . . .

The context for the scholiast's quotation is Aristophanes' imitation of this line in Dionysus' description of the city's ambivalent feelings towards Alcibiades (1425), but the scholiast also gives us two pieces of vital information: first, that the line is from Ion's *Phrouroi*; second, that the line was spoken by Helen to Odysseus. On the basis of this speaker-identification, Welcker then connected the line with the details given by Proclus concerning an Odyssean infiltration into Troy towards the end of the war:²⁷

Ὀδυσσεύς τε αἰκισάμενος ἑαυτὸν κατάσκοπος εἰς Ἴλιον παραγίνεται, καὶ ἀναγνωρισθεὶς ὑφ' Ἑλένης περὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς πόλεως συντίθεται κτείνας τὲ τινας τῶν Τρώων ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀφικνεῖται.

Odysseus disfigures himself and comes to Ilion as a spy: he is recognized by Helen and makes an arrangement [with her] concerning the capture of the city; then he kills some Trojans and arrives back at the ships.

This narrative from the *Little Iliad* provides a suitable dramatic scenario in which Helen might speak to Odysseus in terms that suggest somebody's complicity (σιγᾶ μέν) and also this person's ambivalence (ἐχθαίρει δέ). The identification of this connection reasonably suggests the extended proposition that the basic scenario of Ion's *Phrouroi* centred around this spying-mission by Odysseus into Troy.

²⁷ *TrGF* 19 F**43a (cf. Leurini 2000a: 35), from Proclus' *Chrestomathy*: Allen (1912) 5.107, ll. 4–7 = Davies (1988) 53, ll. 19–22; West (2002) 122 adds the detail of the beggar's clothes found in Apollodorus' version of the story: Ὀδυσσεύς τε αἰκισάμενος ἑαυτὸν <καὶ πενιχρὰν στολὴν ἐνδύς Ἀρ.> κατάσκοπος κτλ.

So far so good: if this proposition is accepted, then more is known about Ion's *Phrouroi* than about any other of his tragedies. But an immediate problem remains, however, in the interpretation of this line addressed by Helen to Odysseus: namely, just who or what is the subject of the verbs in this line? One reading of this line—and one that perhaps depends too heavily on the context of Aristophanes' parodic quotation of the line—argues that the city of Troy is the subject, and the object of ambivalence is Paris, just as Dionysus comments on the ambivalence of the city of Athens towards Alcibiades.²⁸ Another more speculative possibility would be Helen herself, for some unknown reason referring to herself in the third person as torn between her desire to help the Greeks, now “repentant of Aphrodite's folly”, and whatever loyalty she may have felt towards the Trojans.²⁹ But the most intriguing candidate is Hecuba. If Hecuba is the person to whom Helen refers, the fragment taps into a startling (fifth century?) innovation upon the *Little Iliad*'s narrative that has caused surprise since antiquity. An extraordinary exchange in Euripides' *Hecuba* reveals that, for Euripides' dramatic purposes at least, Hecuba was apparently complicit to some extent in Odysseus' escape from Troy following Helen's recognition of the disguised Greek. In Euripides' play it is Hecuba who recalls this startling fact to provide herself with a moral claim on Odysseus now that their respective situations are reversed.³⁰ Is it inconceivable that this detail was also—or, even more daringly, already—found in Ion's *Phrouroi*?³¹ In any event, Helen must have played some role in Odysseus' passage out of the city once she had recognized him, and if Hecuba is the subject of this line, then Helen's role may have extended to securing the ambivalent complicity of Hecuba herself. The dramatic possibilities of this narrative nexus are not inconsiderable: confrontations between Helen and Hecuba, on the one hand, and Hecuba and Odysseus, on

²⁸ See Snell on *TrGF* 19 F44 (= 53 Leurini); von Blumenthal (1939) 47.

²⁹ Aphrodite's folly: borrowed from Schol. Eur. *Hecuba* 241, cited by Collard (1991) on 239–50. Even more speculative would be a first person version of the line: σιγῶ μὲν, ἐχθαίρω δέ, βούλομαι γέ μῃν; which was then inadvertently corrupted by a commentator through an artefact of indirect speech into ἡ Ἑλένη πρὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσεύα λέγει ὅτι σιγᾷ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται γέ μῃν and then subsequently to the form now attested: ἡ Ἑλένη πρὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσεύα φησί· σιγᾷ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται γέ μῃν. For types of citation error, see Arnott (2000) 2–3.

³⁰ Eur. *Hecuba* 239–50; see Collard (1991) on 239–50: the scholiast is incredulous.

³¹ Cf. Collard (1991) on 239–50. The date of Euripides' *Hecuba* is about 424 BC. None of Ion's plays are datable: his first victory was in the four-year period 451–48; he had died before the production of Aristophanes' *Peace* in 421.

the other, are well-known from Euripidean tragedy. Could Ion's *Phrouroi* have featured a provocative take on both these classic confrontations?

The identification of Ion's *Phrouroi* with the narrative scenario supplied by the *Little Iliad* can be circumstantially supported. In the first place, two fragments add tangential buttressing. The first of these evokes a connection with Ida and thus a Trojan context (54 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F45 = Ath. 185a):

{π}ρόθεϊ δέ τοι σῦριγξ
Ἰδαίος ἀλέκτωρ

Listen! the pipes are sounding, the rooster of Ida

Time presses on, as signalled by the pipes at morning or at the end of day?³² In the second brief fragment Helen herself is mentioned (55 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F46 = Hsch. v 601; Phot. 301.7):

νιφόεσσ' Ἑλένη
snowy Helen

This phrase evokes Homeric associations which are noteworthy in terms of vocabulary and characterization: this will be considered in further detail below. In the second place, and as a complement to this tangential support, two other fragments from Ion's *Phrouroi* gain a measure of interpretative relevance when placed in the context of an Odyssean infiltration into Troy. The first evokes a stranger's intrusion into an inner bed-chamber (51 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F43b = Hdn. fr. 24 Hunger):

καὶ πῶς παρήλθεν θάλαμον εὐναῖον ξένος;

and how did the stranger come into the bed-chamber?

Is the stranger Odysseus? Is the bed-chamber Helen's? Odysseus' presence in such intimate quarters finds a plausible correlate in the summary account of Odysseus' intrusion into Troy given by Helen in the Homeric *Odyssey*, where she says that she bathed and dressed him after she had seen through his beggarly disguise (4.252–5). The second fragment evokes a situation in which someone found himself (?) literally or metaphorically routed (52 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F43c = Hdn. fr. 25 Hunger):

³² See Snell (1971a) 109: “*ad pastores noctu vel mane σὺρίπτοντας* Wil. ms. conf. K 13 et Eur. fr. 773, 27”.

<ΟΔΥΣΣ. ?> τροπαῖον αὖ με παρεφόβησεν †ἄβρα

ODYSSEUS (?): ... the delicate [girl] put me to flight in turn, defeated

The textual difficulties here—the line as quoted is short by one foot—complicate speculation. One solution might be the simple addition of ἦ before ἄβρα, which gives a complete tragic trimeter.³³ Certainly the tentative speaker allocation given here by Snell is a plausible one, given that the narrative scenario in the *Little Iliad* turns upon the penetration of Odysseus' disguise and Helen's unexpected response.

We may also consider the role played by the chorus. The title Φρούροι, "Guards", offers a possible identification. But how could this have worked? In Proclus' summary, the narrative of the *Little Iliad* features Trojans being killed by Odysseus as he exits the city: κτείνας τέ τινας τῶν Τρώων ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀφικνεῖται, "Having killed some of the Trojans he arrives at the ships".³⁴ Could these be the Guards of the title? This sort of conflict between a protagonist and the chorus—or a subset of the group that the chorus represents—may appear at first sight hard to imagine, but Euripides' *Bacchae* offers something similar in the off-stage killing of Pentheus. But to complement this testimony from the *Little Iliad* we should also consider a line from Euripides' *Rhesus* dealing with the same incident (506–7):

κτανὼν δὲ φρουροὺς καὶ παραστάτας πυλῶν | ἐξῆλθεν.

And having killed the guards and attendants of the gates he came out.

The verbal coincidence between this line and the title of Ion's play may be just that, but it is suggestive. Can we imagine a scenario in which Odysseus interacts during the course of the play with a chorus of Trojan guards in his beggar disguise, only for it to become subsequently apparent that this same beggar is none other than Odysseus himself, who has already made good his escape, as reported by a messenger, by killing some of the Guard-chorus' fellow-guards?

Questions of this sort raise expectations that cannot be fully satisfied. But it is evidently the case that the narrative terrain covered by Ion's *Phrouroi* was a zone where the actions and ethos of pivotal epic characters like Helen and Odysseus were subjected to further dramatic

³³ The first syllable of ἄβρος is short by nature and will usually scan short in tragic dialogue (plosive-liquid combination), as at Eur. *Med.* 1164.

³⁴ *TrGF* 19 F**43a, from Proclus' *Chrestomathy*: Allen (1912) 5.107, ll. 4–7 = Davies (1988) 53, ll. 19–22.

exploration. Such an observation does not change the face of tragedy as we know it, but it does serve to focus our attention upon certain commonalities of dramatic interest between the major tragedians and playwrights like Ion who have been relegated to a relatively lesser rank. Treatments of Helen and Odysseus in literary productions of the fifth century drew upon the broader epic tradition, above and beyond their role in the canonical *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Even in the fragmentary absence of these cyclic narratives, we can still evidence the intense epic interest in these problematic figures: the Homeric *Odyssey* sign-posts this for us with its glances in *Odyssey* 4 at competing versions of Helen's participation in the events leading immediately to the final fall of Troy.³⁵ In particular, when Helen's own version of her assistance to the disguised Odysseus is swiftly undermined by Menelaus' counter-narrative of her attempted deception of the Greeks inside the Wooden Horse, we can see the *Odyssey* making narrative capital with these cyclic/Odyssean retrojections into the Iliadic narrative.³⁶ These competing narratives within the epic reflect the competitive undercurrent to be found in the broader context of epic performance: whose version of a particular story is best? Ion's *Phrouroi* is another step in this tradition of narratives about Odysseus and Helen.

Of no little importance here is the basic observation that the Homeric *Odyssey* is at its heart a "story about storytelling": the *Odyssey*, as Peradotto has argued, focuses on "the personal *predispositions, interests* and *purposes* of its internal storytellers" in such a way as to legitimate reflection on "its *external* storyteller and his audience" [his emphases].³⁷ Phrased in this way, Peradotto's claim is a modern version of what must have been an instinctive response for poetically ambitious Greeks brought up on the Homeric poems (as broadly conceived), namely reflection on 'Homer', Homeric language and Homer's narratives as both a model and a challenge for their own poetic production.³⁸ A copious range of poets from Archilochus to Callimachus offer testimony to this competitive re-formation of epic tales.

³⁵ On the relationship between the *Odyssey* and cyclic epic concerning this set of narratives, see Severyns (1928) 334–6, 347–9.

³⁶ *Od.* 4.235–89. Helen and Menelaus: Schmiel (1972); Bergren (1981); Goldhill (1998) 19–24; Boyd (1993); Worman (1997). Retrojection: Andersen (1977) 8–9; Goldhill (1991) 101–2; Bassi (1995) 13–4; Doherty (1995) 171.

³⁷ Peradotto (1997) 28.

³⁸ Compare Ford (1999) 232: "beneath the consensus of Homer as the common *paideia* of the Greeks was a constant competition over how to interpret the poem".

The work of a figure such as Stesichorus provides a paradigmatic illustration of such an intense poetic awareness of the Homeric narratives and of the transforming drive to reframe these narratives by creating new forms of poetry with similarly panhellenic scope.³⁹ Fifth century tragedy articulates a similarly ambitious poetic vision. Tragedy's recurrent concern with the figure of Odysseus, and its presentation of Odysseus in ways very different from that of the *Odyssey* itself, underlines the competitive instinct in Greek approaches to their traditional narratives. At the same time as the *nostos* of the Homeric Odysseus was rendered canonical within the institutional frame of the Athenian Panathenaia, Athenian tragedy was exploring the more unscrupulous side of Odysseus *πολύτροπος* in narratives drawn from cyclic epic.

A direct comparison with Sophocles is apposite here.⁴⁰ Sophocles appears to have had a fascination with the figure of Odysseus, and to have engaged closely with narratives about Odysseus told in poems of the epic cycle.⁴¹ What is common to these Sophoclean plays is an intense interest in the *ethos* of his characters and a focus upon figures whose actions and decisions have special significance for those around them: Sophocles uses *πολύμητις* Odysseus as a dramatic touchstone in furthering this interest.⁴² But the fragmentary play *Lakainai* is particularly significant in the present context. Where the relationship between Ion's *Phrouroi* and the *Little Iliad* is argued by modern scholars, the dependence of Sophocles' *Lakainai* upon the *Little Iliad* is attested for us by no less an authority than Aristotle.⁴³ The plot of *Lakainai* appears to have dealt with

³⁹ See Burkert (1987) 50–3.

⁴⁰ For the general comparison, see Webster (1936); more pessimistic are Jacoby (1947a) 3n3; Huxley (1965) 34.

⁴¹ On Sophocles' interest in Odysseus in a range of plays, drawing heavily on the epic cycle (even the *Telegoneia*, cf. FF460, 461), see Kiso (1984) 87–109. In extant Sophoclean plays, Odysseus appears in *Aias* and *Philoctetes*. In fragmentary plays, Odysseus appears in *Iphigenia* (that is, at Aulis; Odysseus is attested talking to Clytemnestra; FF305–12); *Lakainai* (Odysseus or Diomedes tells how they made their way into Troy through the sewer; FF367–9a); *Odysseus Akanthoplex* (Odysseus tries to avoid the prophecy of his death, but overlooks his *other* son Telegonus; FF453–61a) = (?) *Niptra* (F451a); *Odysseus Mainomenos* (Odysseus tries to avoid joining in the expedition against Troy; FF462–7); *Palamedes* (Odysseus takes a grim revenge on Palamedes; FF478–81); *Skyrioi* (probably the fetching of Neoptolemos from Skyros; FF553–61); *Syndeipnoi* (Odysseus involved in trying to persuade Achilles to return; FF562–71); *Teukros* (FF576–9b). Possibles: *Euryalos*; *Aias Lokros*; *Aikmalotides*; *Anteroridai*, the 'Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις, *Polyxene*.

⁴² See, for example, Rose (1992) 306–8 on the sophisticated Odysseus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*.

⁴³ Arist. *Poet.* 1459b4–6. For Sophocles and Homer and the epic cycle, compare Zoilus (as reported by Ath. 277d = *TrGF* 4 T136, 8–9): ἔχαψε δὲ Σοφοκλῆς τῷ ἐπικῷ

the seizing of the Palladium from Troy by Odysseus and Diomedes.⁴⁴ We can refer to Proclus' summary of the *Little Iliad* again, in particular the sentence immediately following the encounter with Helen we have discussed in relation to Ion's *Phrouroi*: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα σὺν Διομήδει τὸ Παλλάδιον ἐκκομίζει ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίου, "and after this, with Diomedes, he carried off the Palladium from Troy". The actual action of the play remains unclear. One fragment reveals that Odysseus and Diomedes made their way through a sewer.⁴⁵ Presumably the chorus of Laconian women, *Lakainai*, were sympathetic to the task undertaken by Odysseus and Diomedes. Possibly the action took place in the house of Helen herself, given the identity of the chorus. In any case, we are clearly drawn into very similar dramatic territory as Ion's *Phrouroi*.

While we encounter the same fragmented obstacle to exposition in the case of Sophocles' *Lakainai* as in Ion's *Phrouroi*, those connections that can be demonstrated are significant. Now, of course Ion was a contemporary of Sophocles and Ion himself memorialized his meeting with the famous Athenian tragedian in his *Epidemiai*.⁴⁶ But this sort of biographical connection is of less interest in the present context than the nexus of subject matter and literary antecedents in these two plays. In Sophocles' *Lakainai* and Ion's *Phrouroi*, both playwrights focus on figures who play critical roles within the Homeric poems, but who were also figures of considerable narrative productivity within the larger epic cycle. Both Ion and Sophocles focus on cracks and points of potential incoherence in the epic narrative tradition in order to generate new dramatic works that depend on Homer and the cycle, but transform this material in new ways for new performance contexts. To this extent, our examination of these plays enables us to fix Ion's tragic composition

κύκλῳ, ὡς καὶ ὅλα δράματα ποιῆσαι κατακολουθῶν τῇ ἐν τούτῳ μυθοποιίᾳ, "Sophocles took such pleasure in the epic cycle that he created all his plays in the footsteps of the narrative frame-making in it". Nearly all Sophocles' Trojan material derives from cyclic epic rather than the Homeric poems as such; this contrasts with Aeschylus but not with Euripides: Radt (1991) 88–9.

⁴⁴ For discussion of the play's fragments, see Pearson (1917) 2.34–8; Welcker (1839) 1.145–51; Radt (1977) on fr. 367–9R; Sutton (1984) 66–8. For the narrative territory, see Gantz (1993) 2.641–6. For related vase-paintings, see Lirussi (1952); Séchan (1926) 156–9; Webster (1967) 149.

⁴⁵ Fr. 367R: στενὴν δ' ἔδυσμεν ψαλίδα κοῦκ ἀβόρβορον ("We made our way into a narrow sewer, not free from filth"), together with Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 2.166: *Diomedes et Ulixes, ut alii dicunt, cuniculis, ut alii, cloacis, ascenderunt arcem et occisis custodibus sustulerunt simulacrum*, "Diomedes and Ulysses—some say by means of mines, others by the means of sewers—climbed the tower and took the image once the guards were killed".

⁴⁶ 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d.

firmly within a literary milieu where panhellenic traditions constituted a vital and shared reference point within the immediate competitive context of the Athenian dramatic festivals.

Ion's Homeric Vocabulary?

In our earlier discussion of Ion's *Phrouroi*, a brief fragment describing Helen herself was quoted: νιφόεσσ' Ἑλένη, "snowy Helen" (55 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F46 = Hsch. v 601; Phot. 301.7). Now a snowy Helen is picturesque enough.⁴⁷ Likewise, it is of passing interest here that Ion's *Chiou Ktisis* appears to have explained the name of Chios from the snow (χίονα) which fell to the ground during the birth-pains of a nymph impregnated by Poseidon, whose child was accordingly named Χίος.⁴⁸ But while the phrase νιφόεσσ' Ἑλένη evokes an epic heritage, it does not do so in a straightforward way, as Michael Clarke also elaborates in this volume. In particular, the usage of the epithet νιφοίεις to describe Helen is quite unusual from the standpoint of Homeric epic. The epic use of νιφοίεις is of mountains only, not least of Olympus itself.⁴⁹ Instances of the epithet in later poets follow this epic usage: in Pindar we find νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα; in Sophocles νιφόντος . . . Παρνασσῷ; in Aristophanes σκόπελον νιφόντα; the one partial exception is Alcaeus' νιφόντος ὠράνω, but an assimilation of Olympus and heaven is already Homeric.⁵⁰ So given this unambiguous set of literary precedents, we must ask what Ion is doing with his snowy Helen: can we unravel something of Ion's verbal art in this unusual description?

One instance of the epithet νιφοίεις in the *Iliad* offers a way forward. In *Iliad* 13 Hector is compared, as he rushes into battle, to a snowy mountain:⁵¹

ἦ ῥα καὶ ὠρμήθη ὄρεϊ νιφόντι εἰκώς,
κεκληγώς, διὰ δὲ Τρώων πέτετ' ἡδ' ἐπικούρων.

⁴⁷ And cf. Eur. *Hel.* 214–6.

⁴⁸ See 98 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F1 = Paus. 7.4.8; Fowler (2000) 262, fr. 1. Compare the testimony in Metrodorus fr. 3A: Fowler (2000) 271. For this incident as an example of a narrative pattern in colonization stories see Dougherty (1993) 65–6.

⁴⁹ Epic usage: see Beck in *Lfgre* [Snell *et al.* (1955–)] s.v. νιφοίεις.

⁵⁰ Pind. *Pyth.* 1.20; Soph. *OT* 473; Ar. *Nub.* 273; on Alcaeus 355 Lobel-Page, compare *Il.* 8.18–27, with Heubeck *et al.* (1988) on *Od.* 6.42–7, for the tendency to assimilate Olympus and οὐρανός.

⁵¹ *Il.* 13.754–5; later imitated at *Aen.* 12.701–703.

Commentators have not always been impressed by these lines.⁵² Bradley underlined the kinetic dynamism of snow in Homer, specifically νίφας and its cognates.⁵³ In a fifth century context, we should also observe that snow could have an uncanny character.⁵⁴ Clarke now suggests that the comparison is of a mountain-god; that is to say, Hector is literally compared to a mountain, but not in the terms usually envisaged by commentators.⁵⁵ At any rate, the image is suggestive of a threat: just so, the bT scholiast uses the terms ἄγριος (“wild”) and φοβερός (“dreadful”).⁵⁶ The associations of snow reinforce the air of menace in the image of Hector as man-mountain hurtling into battle. So we have a partial Homeric precedent for Ion’s use of νιφόεις in relation to a person.

Now, the challenge still remains to elucidate the applicability of νιφόεις in relation to Helen. Among Homeric epithets for Helen, one is of particular interest in this regard. In *Iliad* 19, Achilles refers bitterly to Helen when describing his participation in the war as εἵνεκα ῥιγεδανῆς Ἑλένης (*Il.* 19.325). This epithet is *hapax*, used only by Achilles here. As such, it required explication as an Homeric gloss already in antiquity.⁵⁷ As a “hard word” from Homer, the word was picked up by Apollonius Rhodius.⁵⁸ The commentators on Homer also provide evidence. The scholiast AT on *Il.* 19.325 glosses ῥιγεδανός (“shudder”) as στυγητῆς· τὰ γὰρ λυπηρὰ ψύχει: Helen is hateful, a chilling ill-wind. The discussion in Eustathius is along similar lines, but Eustathius draws the word into a larger discussion of ῥίγησεν κτλ. formulae: the emotional reaction of fear is synonymous with the body’s reaction to cold.⁵⁹ Even within the frame of the *Iliad*, Helen herself seemingly offers a gloss on Achilles’ description of her as ῥιγεδανή in her lament over the body of Hector: πάντες δέ με πεφρίκασιν (“all men shudder at me”,

⁵² At least until Bradley (1967): compare Janko (1992) on *Il.* 13.754–5 with, for example, Leaf (1902) on *Il.* 13.754.

⁵³ Bradley (1967) 39–40.

⁵⁴ Dodds (1960) on Eur. *Bacch.* 661–2.

⁵⁵ Clarke (1997) 70. Cf. Clarke’s analysis of this term in this volume.

⁵⁶ Schol. bT on *Il.* 13.754; cf. Janko (1992) on *Il.* 13.754–5, but note also Clarke (1997) 78n11.

⁵⁷ For the topicality of Homeric glosses in fifth-century education, see Ar. *Daitales* fr. 233 *PCG*, with Ehrenberg (1951) 206. More broadly, see Latte (1925), especially 147–57; Pfeiffer (1968) 12, 78–9.

⁵⁸ Ap. Rhod. 4.1343. On the use of Homeric glosses by Apollonius, see Rengakos (2001).

⁵⁹ See Eust. 111.18, 149.25f., 412.33f., and 1186.65 (*Il.* 19.325).

Il. 24.775). Clearly, the word is persistently marked out as inviting an interpretative response, and we may argue that Ion provides another such gloss with his νιφόεσσ' 'Ελένη. Using the menacing comparison of Hector with a snowy mountain as a cue, Ion has transferred the epithet νιφόεις across to Helen. A certain logic is visible in this transfer: in the language of the Homeric Achilles, Helen is already characterized by the gloss ῥιγεδανός, which may be read as evoking coldness as a negative quality. In making this play upon notable words drawn from the heritage of Homeric epic, Ion appears to show an interest in Homeric language for its own sake, in a form comparable with other prominent fifth-century tragedians.⁶⁰ In short, what we can see in this image of "snowy Helen" is how Ion draws upon his epic heritage within the educational and creative milieu of fifth-century Greece.

With this mobilization of epic vocabulary in relation to Helen, another fragment from Ion's tragedies may be briefly compared. The first fragment from Ion's *Agamemnon* describes a drinking cup in Homeric fashion (1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468c; Eust. 1300.4–5; Hsch. δ 145; tr. Gulick):

οἴση δὲ δῶρον ἄξιον δραμήματος
ἔκπωμα δακτυλωτόν, ἄχραντον πυρί,
Πελίου μὲν ἄθλον, Κάστορος δ' ἔργον ποδῶν

And you shall win a gift worthy of your speed in running,
a dactylote cup, unsullied by the fire,
the prize that Pelias cherished, the work of art won by Castor's feet.

This fragment of Ion is quoted by Athenaeus for several reasons. In the first place, Ion's ἄχραντον πυρί glosses the Homeric epithet ἀπύρωτος used of a φιάλη at *Iliad* 23.270, and Athenaeus is showing us that he can spot Ion's Homeric allusions and elucidate them because he has read Didymus' commentary on Ion's *Agamemnon*. But more than this, Athenaeus' immediate motivation for the preservation of this fragment is the meaning of φιάλη. Athenaeus is not simply elucidating Ion's Homeric allusion, but he also 'corrects' Ion (with the assistance of Didymus) on the grounds that Ion has understood the φιάλη of *Iliad* 23 in its fifth century sense as a drinking-cup (ἔκπωμα).⁶¹ This scholarly correction is

⁶⁰ For example, the adaptation of problematic Homeric lines (*Il.* 5.487–9) at Aesch. *Ag.* 358f., with Fraenkel (1950) 2.190–1 and Kirk (1990) 110–1.

⁶¹ Ath. 468de (cf. 1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1, above) quoting Didymus: ἔδοξε γὰρ ἔκπωμα εἶναι· ἐστὶ δὲ χαλκίον ἐκπέταλον λεβητώδες, ἐπιτηδείως ἔχον πρὸς ὑδάτων

important for what it reveals about Ion's potential engagement in what appears to be a long-standing problem of Homeric interpretation. For, a little later in his sympotic treatise, Athenaeus dwells at length on the problem of this φιάλη and its epithet ἀμφίθετος in a discussion that clearly reflects a lengthy controversy over this passage in Homeric criticism; this controversy is also reflected in the ancient commentators on this passage.⁶² Given what we have seen, above, of Ion's use of Homeric vocabulary in creative ways in relation to νιφέσσ' Ἑλένη, it is open to us here to nuance Athenaeus' take on Ion's Homeric allusion. Ion's ἔκπωμα δακτυλωτόν, ἄχραντον πυρί is not simply a 'mistake', but marks a position taken in a long-running dispute over another problem of Homeric interpretation. In short, we can claim that Ion actively drew upon fifth century interpretations of Homeric vocabulary as he created his tragic offerings for the Athenian stage.

Ion as Playwright at the Athenian Exchange

If it is not unreasonable to conclude that Ion's *Phrouroi* draws upon the narrative scenario preserved for us in the *Little Iliad* summary, and that fragments of Ion's tragedies attest a close interest in Greek epic as a thematic and linguistic source, some broader observations follow. In the first place, we can outline a context for Ion's tragic writing. We have seen that the parameters of the *Little Iliad* story were potentially capable of manipulation, as in Euripides' *Hecuba*. We have seen that the same set of epic materials as in Ion's *Phrouroi* was picked up and dramatized by no less a figure than Sophocles. We have seen that the expeditions of Odysseus into Troy, more fully told in the epic cycle, were of interest already in the Homeric *Odyssey* for the possibilities they afforded for exploring character and *ethos*, despite, or because of, their apparent narrative oddities. We have seen that Ion is drawing upon the linguistic heritage of Greek epic in creating his own tragic narratives. Accordingly if, as it appears, the *Phrouroi* in particular, and Ion's tragedies as a whole, were centred around such material drawn from various epic traditions, Ion must be accorded a place alongside his contemporaries

ψυχρῶν ὑποδοχάς, "For he [sc. Ion] thought that it [sc. the phiale] was a drinking-cup; but it is a spreading cauldron-like vessel of bronze, adapted for the receiving of cold water" (tr. Gulick).

⁶² Ath. 500f–1d. Ancient commentators: see Richardson (1993) on *Il.* 23.270.

Sophocles and Euripides as a tragic playwright who consciously drew upon and reacted to provocative scenarios posed by the tragedians' epic predecessors. As Taplin reminds us, it is easy to forget how *new* tragedy remained in the fifth century.⁶³ Conscious and artful manipulation of material drawn from older literary forms was an integral part of this novelty—indeed it can be argued that tragedy develops as something of a super-genre, “with a sponge-like ability to absorb other genres inherited from other parts of the Greek-speaking world”, as Hall puts it.⁶⁴ Ion, no less than his Athenian counterparts, was participating in the panhellenization of tragedy, as an art form whose fifth century development, popularity and prestige ranked it alongside epic as an especially privileged and influential cultural product.

In the second place, and in a development of this first observation, we can say something about Ion's own place at the Athenian dramatic festivals. By viewing Ion's tragic production within the frame of tragedy's development of, and reaction to, its epic predecessors, it is possible to nuance our understanding of Ion's participation in the characteristically 'Athenian' art-form of tragedy. Ion's tragic victory was not (or was not only) the product of a privileged participation extended by the Athenians to some foreign poets—a kind of 'metic' tragedy—but was instead the manifestation of this poet's participation in a larger cultural project of reacting to and rewriting his Greek epic heritage. The additional fact that this Greek epic heritage had some associations with Ion's own birth-place gives this participation a pleasing logic. Of course, from one point of view, the stories told by Attic tragedy were as much a part of an 'Athenian' institutional frame as the specific procedures and rituals associated with these festivals: on any reading, the institutionalized recitation of the Homeric poems, in whatever precise form, at the Panathenaic festival in Athens is a significant moment in their performance history.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, much of this narrative material was not peculiar to Athens. It must have been to some extent a concomitant of the developing panhellenic pretensions of the Great

⁶³ See Taplin (1999) 54–5.

⁶⁴ Hall (1999) 121. See especially Hall (1989) 162–5; Hall (1999) 121 continues: “A way of looking at tragedy could be to see it as not only aesthetically ‘panhellenizing’, but effectively as imperialism expressed on the level of form”.

⁶⁵ See Nagy (2002) 35 for the institutional authority of the Panathenaia. For a nuanced view of the different levels of ‘Homer’ present in the Athenian body-politic, see Ford (1999) 234–5: “if Homer was common coin in the democratic exchange of ideas, each transaction was also a social exchange of status and ideology”.

Dionysia in particular that the dramatic narratives acted out were not purely focused on matters of local knowledge and interest.⁶⁶ It is this aspect, namely the broader epic background for tragic narratives, that would have offered an accessible point of entry into the Athenian institutional frame for those, like Ion, coming to it from the outside. As such, we can grasp something of the attraction that this special institution must have had for a poet as apparently alive to the possibilities for literary creation afforded by the sung, spoken and written word as Ion was. Of course Ion was scarcely alone in this, but the position of the Attic tragic festivals as a stage on which to interrogate and play out the multifarious dramatic potential of Ion's own epic literary heritage must have been an irresistible target to this poetic jack-of-all-trades.

What does the anecdote of Ion and the wine contribute to this picture? At the least it might serve to situate Ion's victory within a frame of hard-nosed competition at the Athenian dramatic festivals. Very much to this point, Peter Wilson discusses this anecdote in seeking to illuminate later excesses of choregic largesse in the third century:

We have the famous picture of the habits of Athenian audiences at the classical Dionysia, who "throughout the whole *agon* had wine poured out to them and dried fruits were brought along". And in the fifth century the poet Ion (perhaps in concert with his *khoregoi*) took the initiative to distribute the famous product of his homeland, Khian wine, to the Athenian audience after a double victory, in dithyramb and tragedy. Some *khoregoi* could surely not have resisted the opportunity before the judges had cast their votes.⁶⁷

But more than this, this anecdote has helped us in forming an interrogative frame within which Ion's tragic fragments can be partially elucidated. This frame situates Ion, through the medium of Attic tragedy, in the midst of a larger project of competitive panhellenic poetic production. To this extent, the origin of the anecdote becomes less of a problem: if it is not 'original' from an historical point of view, then it certainly offers a provocative later reading of the institutional dynamics of Athenian tragic competition that we may use to focus our examination of Ion's fragmentary remains. Certainly such a focus is not novel: competition within and around the frame of the Athenian dramatic

⁶⁶ See Taplin (1999).

⁶⁷ Wilson (2000a) 275.

and choral festivals is a key feature of the historical record.⁶⁸ The story of Ion and the wine offers a memorable gloss on tragic victory.

Ion's tragic victory is presented as a symbolic exchange, in which performances of dramatic poetry and gifts of prestige-wine become commensurable within the ritual and institutional frame of the festival competition. This 'currency', or commodification, of tragedy as a mode of exchange is similarly suggested by another anecdote about the place of Athenian tragedy within the broader Greek world, namely the story about Athenian prisoners in Sicily who were supposedly able to use quotation from Euripidean tragedy in exchange for their own freedom.⁶⁹ In Ion's case, within the competitive frame of the festival of Dionysus, a poet acquires symbolic capital in exchange for the Athenian consumption of his poetic creations in the midst of what might loosely be termed a "tournament of value".⁷⁰ Poets compete, first, to have their plays performed, and, second, to be among the three poets selected for the honour of victory awarded by the Athenian people. From this perspective, the actual tokens in the exchange are themselves of lesser importance than the symbolic capital in whose acquisition they assist. Which is to say that the plays of Ion, at least insofar as they functioned as commodities within a competitive arena where social standing and success were at stake, were, in a sense, less significant than the victory they brought through their skilful manipulation of a shared literary heritage in the creation of new dramatic entertainments. Of course, such a description is in stark contrast with the subsequent prestige of the canonical tragedians as writers of poetry, not as winners of victories, and we should, of course, remember that this was a group among whom Ion was counted a member. But for the overwhelming importance of the competitive frame of the Great Dionysia and comparable events, we can compare, for example, the striking Athenian monumentalization of success of the dithyrambic *choregos* in the form of a bronze tripod:

⁶⁸ See especially Wilson (2000a) 148–55 on Alcibiades. The relative restrictions placed upon aristocratic munificence by the liturgical system sharpened the competition in these licensed arenas: on this shift and its various implications, see Humphreys (1978) 69–70, 146, 151–2, 256–7; also Veyne (1992) 71–83; Reden (1995) 84; Kallet (1998) 54–8. For the pervasive presence of competition in Athenian civic life, see Osborne (1993).

⁶⁹ Satyr. *Vit. Eur.* fr. 39 XIX; Plut. *Nic.* 29; Taplin (1999) 42–3.

⁷⁰ For the term, see Appadurai (1986b) 21. For "civic exchange and the theatre", and the crucial avoidance of commercial overtones, see Reden (1995) 147–8: "Playwrights, like benefactors and other honorands of the *polis*, were given rewards which had no monetary value: crowns, inscriptions, seats of honour".

even within the democratizing frame of the victor as representative of his tribe (and usually mention is made of the poet and trainer as well), these are evidently high status trophies.⁷¹ Even more starkly, we can compare how, in the quasi-international context of the panhellenic festivals and their prestigious chariot-races, the self-celebration of the aristocratic 'team-owners' was mounted to the literal exclusion of the charioteers who had piloted the team to victory.⁷² In a similar fashion, it was in a context where the social trappings of victory were of the most immediate consequence that Ion is supposed to have given away his Chian wine: Ion responds to the bestowal of the symbolic capital of tragic victory by the Athenian people with a set of reciprocal, individual tokens that directly acknowledge and celebrate his acceptance by the Athenian people at large. He does this not with more plays, but with a Chian commodity *par excellence*, wine. Furthermore, the Dionysiac associations of this gift are evident. The transitory pleasures of its consumption are in keeping with a fact emphasized by Wilson, namely that the city "awarded no durable prize to the *khoregoi* of drama".⁷³ The symbolic capital won in a tragic victory was perhaps appropriately marked in such short-lived, but still patriotic, terms.

"You Will Win a Gift Worthy of Your Running"

A focus on the social standing to be earned through interaction with the great and the good might be considered a theme of Ion's life. In particular, what we know of Ion's *Epidemiai* documents something akin to what we are arguing that Ion's tragic productions represent,

⁷¹ Dithyrambic monuments: Wilson (2000a) 198–235. "Democratized": Kallet (1998) 56; cf. Humphreys (1978) 69–70 on the shift from aristocratic to democratic contexts; this opposition should not be pressed too hard, since liturgies were fully accommodated within democratic practice: Kallet (1998) 57–8. Dramatic monuments are much less visible in the material record: Wilson (2000a) 236–52.

⁷² See Nicholson (2003) 112–3, especially p. 112: "A much larger group of memorials pushes the event itself into the background so that the particular mechanics of the victory, including the role the charioteer played in winning it, do not receive attention. Victory is seen from the point of view of a family's status, not from the point of view of the race itself, as it becomes a possession owned by a family, rather than a crown won through a demanding competition. In fact, the event in which the victory was won is often so unimportant to the design of the memorial that one might easily pass over or forget it".

⁷³ Wilson (2000a) 252.

namely an aspirational participation in status-competition among the great and the good of Greek cultural life.⁷⁴ Indeed, it could be argued that the choice by Callimachus to take Ion as a validating exemplar of πολυειδεία stemmed not least from Callimachus' recognition of a shared project: local boys make good on the most prominent stages of Greek literary life.

Athens was one such stage and our Chian poet made the most of it, but it was not the only such stage. Athens and its festivals formed part of a much larger artistic and religious terrain centred around the great panhellenic sanctuaries. Of singular importance among such sites was Delphi, where prominent individuals and cities took advantage of Delphi's marginal position to advertise their own wealth and prestige before an international audience to an extent not normally permitted in any other location.⁷⁵ We know that during the fifth century the Chians sought prestige in this archetypal panhellenic sanctuary. Our evidence is the altar built by the Chians at Delphi, with its slogan writ large across the monument: Χῖοι Ἀπόλλωνι τὸν βωμόν. Barron comments succinctly: "No other allied state has left any offering quite so blatantly self-advertising as this at either Delphi or Olympia".⁷⁶ What we have uncovered of Ion's participation in the tragic festivals at Athens may likewise be understood within an élite culture of competition among city-states and individuals during the fifth century: Ion's tragedies mobilized a common heritage in the creation of poetic tokens within a complex social tournament where cultural standing was the major prize.

⁷⁴ The anecdote about Sophocles is exemplary here: 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–4d.

⁷⁵ See especially Dougherty and Kurke (2003b) 9–10: "Delphi's marginal status made it an ideal site for elite display beyond the restrictive norms of individual cities (as the archaeological record of dedications attests), while its quadrennial games provided a forum for elite competition and networking".

⁷⁶ Barron (1986) 95–6, especially p. 96; *Fouilles de Delphes* III. 3 no. 212.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

ION OF CHIOS, SOPHOCLES, AND MYTH

JUDITH MAITLAND

Introduction

Aristophanes, when depicting the god Dionysus in search of a decent poet among the dead, sets up a choice between Aeschylus and Euripides, with the passing observation that Sophocles declined to compete against Aeschylus (*Frogs* 786–94). Why did Sophocles not assert his right to compete? He conceded to Aeschylus on his arrival (788), but undertook to take on Euripides himself should Aeschylus lose the contest. Of the tragedians, Euripides is Aristophanes' preferred butt of ridicule, with a few references to the other two scattered among the extant plays. Amidst the fun, Aristophanes clearly assumes that for his audience these three are the tragic poets of note. Aristophanes does, however, parody Ion a little (*Frogs* 706, 1425)¹ and mention him by name once, for the sake of a weak joke (*Peace* 832–7):

OIK. οὐκ ἦν ἄρ' οὐδ' ἃ λέγουσι, κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα
ὥς ἀστέρες γιγνόμεθ', ὅταν τις ἀποθάνῃ;

TP. μάλιστα.

OIK. καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ἀστὴρ νῦν ἐκεῖ;

TP. Ἴων ὁ Χίος, ὅσπερ ἐποίησεν πάλαι [835]
ἐνθάδε τὸν Ἀοῖόν ποθ'· ὥς δ' ἦλθ', εὐθέως
Ἀοῖον αὐτὸν πάντες ἐκάλουν ἀστέρα.

SERVANT: Wasn't there something in what they say, that we turn into stars when we die?

TRYGAIOS: Absolutely.

SERVANT: So who is a star up there now?

¹ Explained in the scholia: 41 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F41 = Ar. *Frogs* 706 and Schol.; 53 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F44 = Ar. *Frogs* 1425 and Schol.; Suda σ 371.

TRYGAIOS: Ion the Chian, who long ago wrote “The Morning Star”; when he departed, immediately everyone called him the Morning Star.²

Ion may have enhanced his own reputation simply by virtue of composing his *Epidemiai*;³ in his memoir, as cited by Athenaeus, Ion describes a merry evening spent with Sophocles (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). Athenaeus gives considerable attention to this event, providing a little information about Ion in the process of preserving more about Sophocles. Actual judgement of his work is found in Pseudo-Longinus *On the Sublime*, where the author, for argument’s sake, supposes the existence of a flawless writer. Which is better, he asks, splendid writing with a few faults (μέγεθος ἐν ἐνίοις διημαρτημένον) or mediocrity without blemishes (τὸ σύμμετρον μὲν ἐν τοῖς κατορθώμασιν)? Should we look for quantity or quality (αἱ πλείους ἀρεταὶ . . . ἢ αἱ μείζους)? ‘Longinus’ finds that great intellect does not guarantee precision, and notes the element of risk-taking (παρακινδυνεύειν) that distinguishes the finest work. He then moves on to make some apt comparisons to illustrate his point, including the damning question, καὶ ἐν τραγωδίᾳ Ἴων ὁ Χίος ἢ νῆ Δία Σοφοκλῆς; (“And in tragedy, Ion of Chios, or by Zeus, Sophocles?”), and finishing with the comment that Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus* is worth all Ion’s plays put together (T17 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T6 = *Subl.* 33.5). ‘Longinus’ draws the same distinction between other pairs of writers, notably Bacchylides and Pindar, but is most emphatic in the case of Ion and Sophocles. This is not to say that Ion’s work was without merit; ‘Longinus’ notes that Bacchylides and Ion were ἀδιόπτωτοι καὶ . . . κεκαλλιγραφημένοι (“impeccable and . . . wrote beautifully”).

Sophocles lived long and was fully active as soldier and citizen; the biographical tradition, ever a creative genre, invests him with a striking

² I do not here follow Leurini’s decision to assign καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ἀστὴρ νῦν ἐκεῖ Ἴων ὁ Χίος; to the slave. On which see Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1902) 306–7; Platnauer (1964) 139.

³ The *Epidemiai* are apparently *Visits*, as a note by John the Alexandrian tells us, noting that “Ypocras” apparently travelled and visited extensively and studied diseases in their locations, hence the term *epidemic* (100 Leurini = Iohan. Alex. *Comm. in Hippoc. Epid.* 6 part. 1.120a69–b2; see Rose 1871). This practice of Hippocrates is also mentioned in the curious *Presbeutikos* ascribed to Thessalos, son of Hippocrates in the Hippocratic corpus ([*Ep.*] 27). Duncan (1939) 135 finds *Epidemiai* not only genuine but a “reflection of a very refined social culture”. Jacoby (1947a) 17 does not see why Webster (1936) should doubt that Ion wrote *Epidemiai*. Cf. West (1985).

and complex personality. Ion may not have lived so long or made such an impact in public life, but his talent and activities are attested, and I would like to examine three connections at least, each admittedly not exclusive on its own, with Sophocles: a broader base of operations than merely Athens; innovation in music; and their use of myth. In pursuing the last connection, this discussion will compare the handling of certain myths by Sophocles and Ion, and recommend the addition of a possibly wrongly allocated fragment of Sophocles to the fragmentary corpus of Ion.

Base of Operations

Elsewhere in this volume, the extent and quality of Ion's milieu is made clear. The remains on Chios go back at least to the Mycenaean epoch,⁴ and excavations have shown the extent of contact between Chios and Phrygia from the eighth century.⁵ It seems that the Chians were first to own and trade in slaves, and they formed their constitution around 550 BC. Thucydides (8.45.4) notes that they were the wealthiest of the Greeks.⁶ It is tantalizing that we have so little of the *Epidemiai*, but if the discussion at the feast in 104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d is anything to go by, perhaps the material was not generally of sufficient substance to survive as more than an occasional source of gossip.⁷ However, at this distance in time, even gossip is precious, and it does remind us that we are examining a cosmopolitan world, where individual connections, usually between wealthy clans and individuals, reached far beyond the limits of individual communities and shaped events more surely than any overt political allegiance. In the world of Chios, with its history of settlement and changing allegiance, Athens would have been on the fringes until the Ionian revolt and its aftermath;

⁴ Hood (1986).

⁵ Boardman (1967).

⁶ Thucydides represents Alcibiades as making this remark to suit his own interests; nonetheless, there is no reason to suppose that this was not an opinion generally held at the time.

⁷ Plutarch cites Ion twice in *Life of Pericles* (5.3, 28.7); Jacoby (1947a) 15 does not wish to call Ion a "scandal-monger" (after Adcock 1927: 171) for repeating a saying of Pericles. Jacoby's conclusion is that Pericles was complimenting the Athenians rather than himself.

in this context, the outcome of the Persian Wars was crucial.⁸ Thereafter we see the political pressures in the rivalry between Chios and Samos, a rivalry that must surely have extended into the social and intellectual spheres.

In addition, the anecdotal evidence firmly places Ion in the company of great men of his times. Plutarch says that he was, as a youth, a fellow-guest with Cimon at the house of Laomedon (106* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F13 = *Cim.* 9.1–6). We also learn that Ion does not seem to have had much time for Pericles (107* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F14 = *Cim.* 16.8–10),⁹ and Athenaeus tells us that Ion was fond of drink and sex and fancied a courtesan Chrysilla, also a favourite of Pericles (T21ab, 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = *Ath.* 436f; *Ael. VH* 2.41).

Given Ion's sociable nature, it is inconceivable that he would not have enjoyed or even actively sought the company of Sophocles when in Athens, but this implies nothing in terms of artistic influence. Webster suggests that Ion has more in common with Sophocles than with Aeschylus and Euripides, although he concludes, "that Ion greatly influenced Sophocles is unlikely".¹⁰ Jacoby demurs: "The tragic fragments of Ion are scanty, and the resemblances in thought, style, metre and vocabulary are not very striking".¹¹ Indeed they are not.

It seems that each dramatist, and this is not confined to dramatists of the time, was inclined to develop his craft in his own way, and Ion was no exception. If anything, he seems to favour Homeric terms: ὑπερφίαλον ("over-bearing"/"courageous") and κελαρύζετε ("babble"/"trickle") in *Eurytidai* (13 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F10 = *Ath.* 495ab); τριστοίχους ("in three rows"), probably of Heracles' teeth, in *Omphale* (30 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F28 = *Phot.* ε 2224; *Et. Gen.* s.v. εὐκηλον; *Hsch.* ε 6925); ὀμφοῶδον ("openly": *Phoenix* 1 48 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F41b = *Phot.* α

⁸ The necessary shift in allegiance shows its pressures in the *Suda* anecdote which records the name of Ion's father, Orthomenes, and his nickname—Xuthus (T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* ι 487). Ion's father Orthomenes, as I gather from the implications in Jacoby (1947a) 1, may well have given his son such a name at this time for political motives. One need only think of Cimon's own sons Lacedaimonios, Oulios/Eleios and Thessalos. This increases the plausibility of the response of observers, even perhaps Cimon himself, in referring to Orthomenes as Xuthus. Jacoby (1947a) 1n7 thinks that Cimon could have called Ion son of Xuthus for a joke, but I see political significance here.

⁹ But see 109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = *Per.* 5.3 (with Jacoby 1947a: 2) and 110* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F16 = *Per.* 28.7.

¹⁰ Webster (1936) 264ff., 273.

¹¹ Jacoby (1947a) 3.

1294). An entry in Hesychius is intriguing: κυδρός (“lusty”: *Eurytidai* 16 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F13 = Hsch. κ 4426).¹² The letters κυδρ appear on a pottery fragment from the Athena temple on Chios.¹³ Ion also uses the term κυδρότερον in elegy (“more lustily”: 90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c),¹⁴ but neither comparative nor superlative form is found in Homer. In 86* Leurini = 744 *PMG* = Ath. 35de is found ἀερσίνοον (“uplifter of thought”), analogous to the Homeric terms ἀερσίπτος and ἀερσίφρων (“uplifting”).

There are one or two other occurrences in Ion’s lyric fragments; in addition to 90 Leurini = 27 West, mentioned above, there are ἐμπαπέως (“quickly”: 91 Leurini = 28 West = Choerob. *ap. Et. Gen.* s.v. ὀρίγανον); and ἡνορέη (“manhood”: 92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120),¹⁵ which is interesting in that Sophocles seems to have used the term, but with α (cf. ἀνόρεος, “manly”: *Nauplios TrGF* F384).

We only have a tiny sample of Ion’s work, but the fragments that survive have been cited for a wide range of reasons. If, despite this randomizing effect, Homeric terms frequently appear, this could confirm Ion in an artistic context somewhat east of Athens, and augment the tradition that Homer was his famous compatriot.¹⁶

Music

All practitioners of Greek music looked to the east, and Ion was no exception. The scholion to Aristophanes *Peace* 835 (T8 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3) gives Ion a repertoire of dithyrambos, tragedies and *mele*, extending this to a variety of composition, and leaving us in no doubt concerning his achievements and reputation:

καὶ πάντῳ δόκιμος ἦν. φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν ὁμοῦ διθύραμβον καὶ τραγῳδίαν ἀγωνισάμενον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ νικῆσαι . . .

And he had a fine reputation. They say that he won in Attica in both dithyramb and tragedy . . .

¹² This is somewhat problematic as Leurini (2000a) 19 shows.

¹³ Boardman (1967) 157, 159–60, 244 (vase 734 = inscription 621).

¹⁴ Leurini (2000a) 53–4 summarizes arguments for and against authorship by Ion of Samos.

¹⁵ In his commentary on this fragment, Leurini (2000a) 56 notes that Ion often uses epic forms in his elegies.

¹⁶ Cf. Simonides fr. 19.1 West (with West 1993); *Vita Herodotea* (in Allen 1912); Rhomaïos (1986).

Winning, even in Attica, may have been a struggle for a metic, even one as sociable, industrious and well-connected as Ion. His mastery of such a broad range of genre, and his delight upon winning in Athens, bear witness to his effort. The *Suda* is not the only source of this poignant anecdote:

ὁ δὲ Χίος Ἴων τραγωδίαν νικήσας Ἀθήνεσιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔδωκε Χίον κεράμιον.

When he won the tragic prize at Athens he presented a flask of Chian wine to each of the Athenians.

(T12 Leurini = *TiGF* 19 T3 = *Suda* α 731 = Ath. 3f)

One way to attract notice is to innovate. Sophocles himself, according to the *Vita Sophoclea* 4, πολλὰ ἐκαινούργησεν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι, “brought many innovations to the contests”. At the end of the *Vita* there is the remark that, φησὶ δὲ Ἀριστόξενος ὡς πρῶτος τῶν Ἀθηνηθην ποιητῶν τὴν Φρυγίαν μελοποιῶν εἰς τὰ ἴδια ῥήματα παρέλαβε καὶ τοῦ διθυραμβικοῦ τρόπου κατέμειξε, “Aristoxenus says that he was the first of the Athenian poets to bring the Phrygian mode of composition to his own writing and combine it with the dithyramb” (*Vita* 23).

It is likely that Ion practised such innovations as well. Fragments hint at his interest and expertise in music, giving the impression that later commentators turned to his work for enlightenment concerning recondite musical terminology. For instance, 93 Leurini = 32 West, if it is authentic,¹⁷ is a highly technical tribute to the eleven-stringed lyre. If Levin is right, the tuning of this lyre could accommodate in a series of tetrachords the six modes of Plato, including the Phrygian.¹⁸ The testimonium containing the fragment is taken from Cleonides’ discussion, derived from Aristoxenides, of the technical uses of the term τόνος (“tone”); both fragment and testimonium bear witness to musical expertise on the part of the writer:

ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ φθόγγου χρῶνται τῷ ὀνόματι οἱ λέγοντες ἐπτάτονον τὴν φόρμιγγα, καθάπερ Τέρπανδρος καὶ Ἴων. ὁ μὲν γάρ φησιν·
ἡμεῖς τοι τετράγηνυν ἀποστέρξαντες αἰοιδᾶν
ἐπτατόνῳ φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους.

¹⁷ Leurini (2000a) 57–8 provides a full survey of the textual problems.

¹⁸ Levin (1961) rebuilds this fragment as well as the eleven-stringed lyre. West (1974) cites this article in his detailed defence of Ion’s authorship of the piece. In attempting a translation, I have been persuaded by Levin’s argument, but have accepted Leurini’s reading of εἰς line 2.

ὁ δέ·
 ἑνδεκάχορδε λύρα, δεκαβάμονα τάξιν ἔχουσα¹⁹
 εἰς²⁰ συμφωνούσας ἀρμονίας τριόδους,
 πρὶν μὲν σ' ἐπτάτονον ψάλλον διὰ τέσσαρα πάντες
 Ἕλληνες σπανίαν μούσαν ἀειράμενοι.

With regard to the actual note, those who call the phorminx seven-toned use the term *tone*, as, for example, Terpander and Ion. The former says:

We indeed, sick of four-string ditties,
 will sing out new songs to the seven-stringed phorminx.

The latter says:

Eleven-stringed lyre, with your ten-step arrangement
 for the concordant triple way of harmony,
 once in seven tones through tetrachords did pluck you
 all the Greeks, lifting up a scanty muse . . .

(93 Leurini = 32 West = Cleonid. *Isag. harm.* 12, p. 202 Jan = Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius *Harmonica* p. 116 Jonker)

In each of these quotations, an authority is cited for a musical innovation. Terpander is well established as a legendary musician and innovator; Ion must surely have had some standing to be quoted in the same context.²¹

In *Omphale* 26a Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22 = Ath. 634ef, Ion refers to Lydian harp-players—ψάλτριοι—and to ancient songs:

ΟΜΦ. ἀλλ' εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτριοι, παλαιθέτων
 ὕμνων ἀοιδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε.

OMPHALE: Come now, Lydian harp-girls, singers of ancient hymns, honour our guest.

A *psalterion* is a harp,²² and although the harpists are Lydian, this implies nothing about the harps themselves. In another fragment from *Omphale*, however, Ion seems to be more precise about the pipe:

ΟΜΦ. Λυδός τε μάγαδις αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς

Let the *magadis* [sc. and let the] Lydian pipe lead the song.
 (26b Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F23 = Ath. 634ce; Hsch. μ 3)

¹⁹ ἔχοις ἀεὶ fere codd.: ἔχουσα Meibom, ἔχοισα Diels.

²⁰ τὰς συμφ. codd.: καὶ West. See also Power's translation in this volume.

²¹ Other examples: Athenaeus 185a provides us with 49 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F42 (*Phoenix* 2; see Schmidt 1862: 230–1) in explaining that Ion uses the term βαρύς to refer to Phrygian music; and with *Phrouroi* 54 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F45 = Ath. 185a in which Ion apparently refers to the syrinx as screeching like an Idaean cock.

²² West (1992b) 74n115 notes that the setting is Lydian.

Is the *magadis* a Lydian *aulos*? It is hard from a single line to tell exactly what is being said, but it is at least clear that it is the *aulos* that is Lydian. The term *magadis* itself is highly problematic;²³ so problematic indeed that we would not have this fragment at all, not to mention some others from Alcman, Anacreon and Sophocles, had Athenaeus not been interested in working out whether the *magadis* were a kind of *aulos* or not.²⁴ The Sophocles fragment (*TrGF* 238 from *Thamyras*) is of limited help as the use of *magadis* is unmetrical:²⁵

πηκταὶ δὲ λύραι καὶ μαγαδίδες
τά τ' ἐν Ἑλληνισι ζόαν' ἡδυμελῆ

The pegged lyres and magadides and
the sweet-noted instruments in Greece.

It seems that Ion's line has confused the issue.²⁶ If Athenaeus derived only this one line from Tryphon, and Tryphon only knew it without its context, the chain of information can be seen as a chancy thing. It seems likely that *magadis* refers to a way of producing music in octave concords; this suggestion certainly makes sense of both these passages. For present purposes, the disputed term makes a link, however tenuous, between Sophocles and Ion.

Sophocles *TrGF* F238 is taken from *Thamyras*, which has a dark context of rivalry in musical practice. This tale and others like it are testimony to the ferment of creativity and innovation that gave rise to Greek theatre. There is no doubt that artistic endeavour was integral to the successful life, and indeed, for a time, to the successful public career, if the lives of Sophocles and Ion are anything to go by. All commentators on Greek music remark on the profusion of images depicting the making of music, and music was deeply embedded in the public and private negotiations of a culture based on competition, power and patronage—a culture at the heart of which lay the symposium. Pindar himself famously affirmed his ability to confer immortality with the

²³ West (1992b) 73n110 and Barker (1988) have independently come to the conclusion that the implication of the term *magadis* may have more to do with the production of octave concords than with the configuration of the instrument itself. This view is accepted by Landels (1999) 41, 279n29. Chailley (1979) 210, 213, 274 makes a tentative connection between the *magadis* and the *pektis*, noting the octave concord implied in the use of the term μαγαδίζω.

²⁴ Leurini (2000a) 23–4 cites the relevant passages.

²⁵ West (1992b) 73n109.

²⁶ See, for instance, Barker (1984) 268–9.

arrows—and other projectiles—of fame, thus combining the technology of art and war.²⁷ If there is no doubt that for music, inspiration and stimulus came from the east, the same can certainly be said of myth, to which the discussion must now pass.

The Oechalian Legend

The fragments of Ion's tragedies include remnants of plays taken from the cycle of Heracleian legends linked with Oechalia. Interest in Heracles is not in itself peculiar to Ion, but these legends are of interest, as they can be discussed with reference to Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.

In Sophocles' version, at any rate, this myth is set in Euboea and concerns the last and fatal exploit of Heracles. Eustathius records a curious tale in which he asserts that Creophylus of Samos entertained Homer, who made a gift to him of the authorship of the Oechalian poem (330.41). Odd though the tale is, it is interesting in that it hints at rival claims of Chios and Samos to Homer, and links Homer, Ion and Sophocles in a shared interest in the myth.

Three plays of Ion—*Alcmene*, *Omphale* and *Eurytidai*—are connected to the Heracles cycle, and the Oechalian myth and the tale of Omphale are knit into Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. In addition, Sophocles' *Thamyras* concerns the musician mentioned in *Iliad* 2.595–6 as travelling from Oechalia and Oechalian Eurytus.²⁸ Of the three plays of Ion, only *Omphale* yields remnants of any substance.

The tradition identifies *Omphale* as a satyr play, and of that there seems little doubt. If Sophocles' play represents the tradition against which Ion was writing, then it is not unreasonable to use it as a point of contrast. *Omphale* is tantalizing because it represents directly the action that is only obliquely related in Sophocles' play. In *Trachiniae*, Heracles' behaviour in Oechalia looms as the cause of the play's crisis, and the episode with Omphale becomes part of the fabric of Lichas' lies.

²⁷ *Ol.* 2.89–90, 13.93–5, *Nem.* 6.26–8, 9.55 and note βαρυφθόγγιο νευρᾶς (“deep-toned bowstring”, tr. Race) of Heracles' bowstring (*Isthm.* 6.35).

²⁸ For a discussion of the location of Oechalia and comment on legends concerning musical competitions, see Kirk (1985) 216. The full documentation appears in *RE* 17.2: 2097–2101.

Omphale apparently begins with the appearance of Heracles and Hermes on their way to sell Heracles as a slave.²⁹ Heracles must be speaking in 22 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17a = Gramm. Ign. *POxy* 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127):

Ὅρων μὲν [ἦ]δη Πέλοπος ἐξελεύ[νο]μεν,
Ἑρμῇ, βόρειον [ἵπ]πον, ἄνεται δ' ὁδός

Hermes, we now drive Boreas' foal out from
the territories of Pelops, for the road ends...

If, in fact, the pair have arrived in *Omphale*'s territory, particularly if the action takes place in the vicinity of the Pactolus river, Heracles' comment is odd, as they are now in the land of Pelops' birth and parentage. Certainly, the comment would have provided Hermes with an opportunity to point out the irony of their destination. If this is correct, those who have seen a reference to Pelops' original home have some justification.³⁰

It has been the practice to include 23 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F18 = Strabo 1.3.19 (cf. Eust. in Dion. Per. 476; Plin. *NH* 4.63) next in sequence, presuming a description of the journey to Lydia, but it is impossible to know why we should have a description of Euboea at this point, as it anticipates the end of Heracles' career:

Εὐβοῖδα μὲν γῆν λεπτὸς Εὐρίπου κλύδων
†Βοιωτίας ἀκτῆς ἐχώρισεν ἐκτέμνων
πρὸς κρήτα πορθμόν†

The light wave of the Euripus separated the Euboean
land from the Boeotian crag, cutting out
towards the Cretan strait.

However, it brings *Trachiniae* to mind, and the tale of Eurytus:

ΥΛ. Εὐβοῖδα χώραν φασίν, Εὐρύτου πόλιν...

HYLLUS: They say [he is attacking] the land of Euboea, the city of Eurytus... (*Trach.* 74)

ΛΙ. Ἀκτὴ τις ἔστ' Εὐβοίς...

LICHAS: There is a crag in Euboea... (237)

²⁹ Leurini (2000a) 21. See discussion by Easterling in this volume.

³⁰ von Blumenthal (1939) 35–7; Snell in *TrGF ad loc.*

HY... ἀκτὴ τις ἀμφίκλυστος Εὐβοίας ἄκρον
Κήνιαον ἔστιν...

HYLLUS: Lofty Kenaion is a wave-washed crag in Euboea... (752–3)

The Fate of the hapless Lichas is described thus:

ῥιπτεῖ πρὸς ἀμφίκλυστον ἐκ πόντου πέτρων·

He hurled him at the wave-washed cliff looming out of the sea... (780)

Heracles screams in agony:

ἀμφὶ δ' ἐκτύπουν πέτραι,
Λοκρῶν ὄρειοι πρῶνες Εὐβοίας τ' ἄκραι.

The rocks on each side echoed,
the flat shores of Locris and the crags of Euboea... (787–8)

Was it intended to bring *Trachiniae* to mind? If so, the references to Euboea make more sense. There may be more ideas in common in the references to the famous oak trees in Heracles' tale:

ἐξανθρακώσας [harpax.] πυθμέν' εὐκηλον δρυός

Having reduced to ashes the secure base of an oak.
(*Omphale* 30 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F28 = Phot. ε 2224; *Et. Gen.* s.v. εὐκηλον; Hsch. ε 6925)

Compare two passages from *Trachiniae*:

μαντεῖα καινά...
ἃ τῶν ὀρείων καὶ χαμαικοιτῶν ἐγὼ
Σελλῶν ἐσελθὼν ἄλσος εἰσεγραψάμην
πρὸς τῆς πατρώας καὶ πολυγλώσσου δρυός

New prophecies...
which I carved when I came to the grove
of the mountain-dwelling Dodonans who lie on the ground,
on the prophetic oak of my father... (*Trach.* 1165–8)

πολλὴν μὲν ὕλην τῆς βαθυρρίζου δρυός
κείραντα...
καὶ πευκίνης λαβόντα λαμπάδος σέλας
πρῆσαι.

Cutting through the timber of many deep-rooted oaks...
to take a burning torch of pine and
set fire to them. (*Trach.* 1195–9)

These are slender congruences on which to base an argument, but the humorous features of *Omphale* lend a little more substance. Ion seems to give the following words to Omphale:

ἴτ' ἐκφορεῖτε, παρθένοι, κύπελλα καὶ μεσομφάλους
<φιάλας>

Go, maidens, bring out the goblets and navelled
dishes.

(25 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F20 = Ath. 501f; cf. Eust. 1261.24; Hsch. μ 923; Pollux 6.98)

The term *mesomphalos*, here referring to a type of dish, is regularly used in tragedy and elsewhere to refer to Delphi. In this case, it seems mischievous on two grounds: there is a play on Omphale's name and an absurd parallel in the reference to dishes. This is certainly appropriate to a satyr play. The dishes themselves are authentic enough and an illustration can be seen in the excavation records.³¹ The humour continues as Ion develops his plot in great contrast to the sombre action of *Trachiniae*. It seems that Heracles succumbs to soft living, with another reference to the Peloponnese:

βακκάρις δὲ καὶ μύρα
καὶ Σαρδιανὸν κόσμον εἰδέναι χροός
ἄμεινον ἢ τὸν Πέλοπος ἐν νήσῳ τρόπον

It is better to know *bakkaris* and perfumes,
and the Sardis fashion in cosmetics,
than the lifestyle in the Peloponnese

(27 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F24 = Ath. 690b)

The reference to the Isle of Pelops recalls the territories mentioned in 22 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17a = Gramm. Ign. *POxy* 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127), supporting the notion that comparisons are being drawn between Pelops' two territories. The rare word *bakkaris* is found in Sophocles (*TrGF* F1032), and a few other sources are noted. It seems to be Lydian in origin.

In 28 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F25 (= Ar. Byz. fr. 23 A–C Slater *ap.* Eust. 1761.31; Pollux 5.101; Schol. Hom. Θ 545 (*Anecdota Parisina* 3.46.6–8 Cramer); Hdn. 2.767.20 Lentz; Choerob. *Gr. Gr.* 4.1.344.2), Heracles' seduction seems nearly complete:

³¹ Boardman (1967) 225.

καὶ τὴν μέλαιναν στίμῃν ὀμματογράφον
and that black paint around the eyes

Is Heracles getting dressed? If so, it seems reasonable to ascribe to *Omphale* 73* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F59 = Pollux 7.60:³²

βραχὺν λίνου κύπασσιν ἐς μηρὸν μέσον
ἐσταλμένος

a little frock reaching halfway down his thigh.

Fragments 28 and 73* Leurini have survived because of the unusual terminology they preserve; it seems likely that at this point Ion chose to emphasize the loss of Heracles' Greekness as well as his status and masculinity.

The next few fragments clearly depict Heracles' approach to food and drink:

εἶχεν . . . τοὺς ὀδόντας . . . τριστοίχους Ἑρακλῆς

Heracles . . . had . . . three rows of teeth.

(29* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F*30 = Pollux 2.95; Tzetz. *Chil.* 3.957–8)³³

ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς εὐφημίας
κατέπινε καὶ τὰ κᾶλα καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρακας

during the rites

he gulped down the firewood and the coals

(31 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F29 = Ath. 411b; Eust. 870.12, 1817.18)

οἶνος οὐκ ἔνι
ἐν τῷ σκύφει

Isn't there any more wine in the cup?

(32 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F26 = Ath. 498e; Eust. 1775.19)

Heracles is out of wine perhaps, as the next fragment seems to confirm:

ἔσπεισας· ἀλλὰ πῖθι Πακτωλοῦ ρόας

You've poured the libation; so drink up the Pactolus river.

(33 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F27 = *Et. Gen.* s.v. πῖθι; *Et. M.* 671.41 Gaisford)

³² Snell in *TrGF ad loc.* suggests that this refers to Heracles in Omphale's chiton; see also Easterling in this volume.

³³ Leurini (2000a) 25 compares Scylla in *Od.* 12.91–2: ἐν δὲ τρίστοιχοι ὀδόντες, | πυκνοὶ καὶ θαμέες, "therein three rows of teeth, thick and close" (tr. Murray).

This is the line that seems to give the play its setting.

Sophocles and Ion have their different ways of depicting Heracles' servitude:

ΛΙ. Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν πλεῖστον ἐν Λυδοῖς χρόνον
κατείχεθ', ὡς φησ' αὐτός, οὐκ ἐλεύθερος,
ἀλλ' ἐμποληθείς· τοῦ λόγου δ' οὐ χρὴ φθόνον,
γύναι, προσεῖναι, Ζεὺς ὅτου πράκτωρ φανῇ.
Κεῖνος δὲ πραθεὶς Ὀμφάλῃ τῇ βαρβάρῳ
ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξέπλησεν, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει . . .

LICHAS: No, but he spent most of his time in Lydia
—as he actually says—not a free man,
but a chattel. One must not suspect any tale,
Madam, if Zeus seems to bring it about.
And he, the property of the foreigner Omphale,
completed a year's contract—and that's what he says himself.
(Soph. *Trach.* 248–53)

οὐ τὰπὶ Λυδοῖς οὐδ' ὑπ' Ὀμφάλῃ πόνων
λατρεύματ' . . .

not his tedious servitude in Lydia for Omphale . . .
(*Trach.* 365–7)

Consider Ion's version:

<ΗΡΑΚΛ.> ἐνιαυσίαν γὰρ δεῖ με τὴν ὀρτὴν ἄγειν
[HERACLES:] For a year I must keep on feasting . . .
(*Omphale* 38 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F21 = Ath. 258f)

The designation of *Omphale* as a satyr play seems secure; in comparing the text of Sophocles and the fragments of Ion, I would like to go a little further and make a tentative suggestion that Ion had *Trachiniae* in mind when writing his satyr play. If *Trachiniae* was written around the 430s, and Ion did not die very long before the presentation of Aristophanes' *Peace*, the chronology is possible. Ion seems to have been a lively character and capable of these sly references. The normal travesty of the myth is clear enough,³⁴ but there seems to be more in these small remnants.

The other conspicuous character in this narrative portion of *Trachiniae* is Eurytus, ruler of Oechalia and father of Iole. Sophocles ingeniously

³⁴ The classic example is, of course, Euripides' *Cyclops*, although it satirizes Homer, not another play.

Some Tentative Conclusions

When dealing with versions of myths, it is difficult to draw conclusions based on scattered phrases. Nonetheless, it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that at the very least Ion and Sophocles drew upon a common stock for their accounts of the Heracles legends. There is also no doubt that Ion's lively account of Heracles' servitude, particularly the obligation to feast all year long, would have gained in humour had it been written after, and thus been compared with, Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.

Ion seems to have been a conspicuous and well-connected figure in his time. There is no doubting his ability, as some victories are credited to him, and his delight at his victory in Athens suggests that it may not have been easy for a non-citizen to break into the inner artistic and political circles of the city. Whatever the causes, although his career must have spanned something more than twenty years,³⁶ his poetic output, at any rate, seems to have been varied but not substantial. In spite of this, he is noticeable in testimonia, but whatever his reputation in his own time, his work was apparently not subsequently held in sufficient esteem to ensure its survival in any quantity (as Henderson and Olding discuss in this volume). On the other hand, when one considers the size of his output compared with that of Sophocles, not to mention the length and extent of Sophocles' life and career, he is by no means inconspicuous as an artist. Furthermore, the diversity of his interests and output, and the brilliance of the circles in which he seems to have moved, have earned him notice as a personality in his own right, loyal to his native Chios, committed to the alliance with Athens, and using his personal abilities and connections to tread with care the difficult diplomatic paths of the fifth-century Aegean.

³⁶ See Jacoby (1947a) 1–4.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

LOOKING FOR *OMPHALE*

PAT EASTERLING

Introduction

How much can we say for certain about Ion's *Omphale*? Not a great deal, but even that is considerably more than we can recover about most of the hundreds of lost satyr plays performed at the Athenian dramatic festivals and elsewhere, and it is worth trying to go a little further.

The known facts can be set out briefly:

1. *Omphale* is well attested as a play by Ion, and specifically identified as a satyr play in 23 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F18 = Strabo 1.3.19: Strabo, in a passage on offshore islands, cites “Ion in the satyr play *Omphale*” for a reference to Euboea and the Euripus.
2. The play is quoted or referred to by a range of ancient writers. Athenaeus is the richest source with seven quotations of whole lines or more, suggesting that he may have had access to a complete text (25, 38, 26a, 26b, 27, 32, 31 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F20, F21, F22, F23, F24, F26, F29). The other fragments come from the usual sources,¹ contexts where ancient scholars are discussing exotic words or unfamiliar usages, but this does not tell us much about the survival of the whole play. However, there are hints that *Omphale* attracted more than usual attention: Athenaeus 634cf, in a discussion of the scholarly debate over the correct identification of the musical instrument called *magadis* by the Lydians (26a, 26b Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22, F23), mentions Aristarchus as the author of a note on the relevant line, and cites a work by Didymus entitled

¹ Hesychius (24; 34 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F19; F31 = σ 1515; ε 5919, 6050), *Et. Gen.* (33; 30 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F27; F28 = s.v. πῖθι; s.v. εὐκηλον), Pollux (29* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F*30 = 2.95), Harpocration (35 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F32 = s.v. θίασος), Herodian (36 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F33 = *Katholike prosodia* 1.25.18 Lentz). In addition to the standard references (22–38 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 FF17a–33a), fragments and testimonia can be found in Pechstein and Krumeich (1999) 480–90 [cited as *Satyrspiel*].

Counterexplanations on Ion (Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν ταῖς εἰς Ἴωνα Ἀντεξηγήσεσιν . . .); while another fragment which quotes the opening of the play is from a papyrus preserving an unnamed scholar's notes on literary problems (22 Leurini = 19 F17a = Gramm. Ign. *POxy* 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–7)).²

3. There is no doubt about the outlines of the story on which the play is based,³ though this tells us little about the plot. After Heracles treacherously killed Iphitus, son of King Eurytus of Oechalia, he suffered a severe illness, consulted the Delphic oracle, and was required to be sold as a slave for a period (the sources vary between one and three years) to atone for his crime; Hermes took charge of the sale, and he was bought by Omphale queen of Lydia. In some versions he was set free by Omphale and became her lover and the father of her son Lamus (or Agelaus, identified by Apollodorus 2.7.8 as an ancestor of the house of Croesus).⁴
4. The three characters known to have been involved in the play are Heracles, Omphale and Hermes, and there must have been a role for Silenus. The “Lydian harpists” mentioned in 26a Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22 = Ath. 634ef may refer either to the chorus or to a secondary group.
5. The play is set in Lydia, and aspects of Lydian lifestyle figure in the fragments.
6. From Aristophanes *Peace* 832–5, which makes a gracious ‘obituary’ reference to Ion, we know that he was dead by the Dionysia of 421; this implies that 422 must have been the latest possible date for the composition and (presumably) staging of the play. There is no other indication of date; if we can trust the *Suda* entry (T4 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T1 = *Suda* ι 487), which says that Ion first began competing in the dramatic festivals in 451–48, we have a period of twenty-five to thirty years during which it might have been composed.

² 37* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F33a = Gramm. Ign. *POxy* 13.1611 (fr. 16), from the same papyrus, probably also refers to discussion of the play.

³ The story of Heracles’ dealings with Eurytus and Iphitus is alluded to at *Od.* 21.22–37; the schol. on this passage gives detail of the enslavement of Heracles, quoting Pherecydes (*FGrH* 3 F82b). For later résumés, with variations, cf. Diod. Sic. 4.31.5–8 and Apollod. 2.6.3 (the passages from Pherec. and Diod. Sic. are conveniently cited in *Satyrspiel* 481–2). Cf. Davies (1991) xxvii–xxx; Boardman (1994).

⁴ Cf. the reference to “Acheles who ruled over the Lydians”, as son of Heracles and Omphale by Schol. *Il.* 24.616b.

Beyond these very basic statements there is not much that can be said without a degree of guesswork. A reconstruction of the plot would take us many guesses too far, but it is worth trying to formulate the questions that need answering:

1. Are there any details in the mythological tradition, or other plays by Ion and his contemporaries, that might help to suggest more about the scenario or subject matter of *Omphale*?
2. Can we get any further with identifying *dramatis personae* and chorus and forming some idea of the action, or at least the themes, of the play?
3. Can anything be extracted from possible intertextual references?
4. Does the later reception of the Omphale story bear any relation to this play?

The Mythological Tradition

In Diodorus and Apollodorus (note 3 above), Omphale is daughter of King Iardanus of Lydia; Diodorus makes her a virgin queen, but in Apollodorus she is the widow of king Tmolus. The story of her union with Heracles may reflect a conflict of genealogical claims, or appropriation by the Mermnad dynasty (from Gyges onwards) of Heraclid ancestry: the 'normal' version of the history of the Lydian kings down to Candaules was that they descended from the offspring of Heracles and a slave girl of Iardanus (Hdt. 1.7).⁵ But it is unlikely that the play is engaging with an issue so remote from the interests of an Athenian audience, and there are more obvious reasons for dramatizing the story of Omphale as Heracles' partner: for example, the idea of the mighty hero's enslavement to a woman, and the scope that its location offered for elaborating on fantasies of Lydian luxury. It is possible that Ion's tragedy *Eurytidai* was composed for the same competition as *Omphale*, as Webster suggested;⁶ if so, there may have been thematic links between the story that Heracles sacked Oechalia for the sake of Eurytus' daughter Iole in the tragedy, and his subjection to Omphale in the satyr play.

⁵ As Schauenburg (1960) 57n6 points out, both traditions must have been known in Lydia in the sixth century.

⁶ Webster (1936) 267; he also wanted to bring in the *Alcmene*.

According to Diodorus and Apollodorus, Heracles, while in the service of Omphale, carried on with his usual job of getting rid of monsters and enemies: the two instances on which they agree are his killing of Syleus and his capture of the Cercopes on Omphale's behalf; and Diodorus adds that it was admiration for his achievements that made Omphale take notice of him, free him and make him her partner. No hint of such exploits survives in the fragments, but since these add up to less than twenty lines, any argument from silence is bound to be weak. The best we can do (with Pechstein and Krumeich)⁷ is to leave the question open, though we may feel reluctant to bring in references to these extra figures if there is a neater way of reading the situation in *Omphale*, particularly as they are not Lydian: Syleus is associated with Aulis and the Cercopes with Ephesus.

The Syleus story as dramatized by Euripides in a lost satyr play⁸ may, however, be worth looking at as a separate episode in the life of Heracles as slave. Syleus is a typical 'ogre' figure, whose brutality in forcing people (including the chorus of satyrs) to work in his vineyard is punished by Heracles with the complete devastation of his property and finally with death. Heracles rescues the daughter of Syleus from the attentions of the satyrs, and the play ends with him regaining his freedom, along with Silenus and the satyrs. Did *Omphale* follow this familiar pattern, with Omphale herself or her enemies in the 'ogre' role, or were there more distinctive features in this enslavement story?

Two factors may be relevant here: first, the different symbolic⁹—and comic—potential of subjection to a female, and second, the strongly Dionysiac associations of Lydia, its wine (Mount Tmolus was famous for its exceptional vineyards) and its music-making.

Characters and Action

What do the fragments tell us about the roles of the characters?

Hermes must have been in control in the Prologue as the divine agent responsible for selling Heracles to Omphale. The play opens with Heracles addressing him: "Hermes, we are already driving the horse

⁷ *Satyrspiel* 490.

⁸ See *Satyrspiel* 457–73.

⁹ To be associated, perhaps, with the ambivalence of Heracles in the mythological and cultic tradition, for which see especially Loraux (1990).

of the north wind from the bounds of Pelops' land, and our journey is done" (22 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17a = Gramm. Ign. *POxy* 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127)).¹⁰ The pair are arriving, in fact, at Omphale's palace, where the action presumably centres on the reception given to Heracles, and Hermes' role may not extend beyond the prologue; perhaps the actor playing his part would then reappear as Silenus.

Omphale could be fulfilling the satyr-play role of 'ogre', like Syleus, and piling laborious or demeaning chores on Heracles, but there is no hint of this in the fragments, unless perhaps she sets him a labour which by an effect of *para prosdokian* turns out to be the 'ordeal' of a year-long party. This could give particular point to 38 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F21 = Ath. 258f, presumably spoken by Heracles: "For I must celebrate the feast all year long" (with the Ionic ὁρτήν instead of ἐορτήν neatly suggesting that the great Dorian hero is picking up the local way of talking).¹¹ This recalls, and may be turning upside-down, the tradition that Heracles was commanded by the oracle to serve as a slave for a year.¹² Alternatively, the lavish entertainment could be laid on as a reward for Heracles' heroic services in defeating Omphale's enemies. But 26a Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22 = Ath. 634ef has Omphale treat him as a guest, not as a member of her household who has returned from a mission, and it may be better to think further about the implications of making the party the central motif.

Heracles is evidently the 'hero' of a feast on a scale to challenge even his notorious appetites. In addition to 38 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F21 = Ath. 258f, there are other hints of 'superman' extravagance: 31 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F29 = Ath. 411b (cf. Eust. 870.12, 1817.18) has him consuming the logs and the charcoal during the holy silence of a sacrifice, and if 29* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F*30 = Pollux 2.95; Tzetz. *Chil.* 3.957–8 belongs here, its description of Heracles having three rows of teeth would point in the same direction.¹³ 32 Leurini = *TrGF* 19

¹⁰ On the interpretation of βόρειον ἵππον as a flying horse, and the "land of Pelops" as Phrygia, see *Satyrspiel* 488–9, citing von Blumenthal (1939) 36, Lloyd-Jones (1957) 25–6, and Leurini (1981). Hermes may be the speaker in the next fragment (23 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F18 = Strabo 1.3.19), which seems to give details of the route that he and Heracles (and the horse) have followed from Greece.

¹¹ Reading the party as "year long", as opposed to "annual" (for example, Herodotus 4.180), suits the satyric context.

¹² Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 252–3; the schol. on 253 mentions a version in which the prescribed period was three years rather than one.

¹³ See *Satyrspiel* 486n17 for doubts.

F26 = Ath. 498e; Eust. 1775.19 (“There is no wine in the cup”) and 33 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F27 = *Et. Gen.* s.v. $\pi\tilde{\iota}\theta\iota$; *Et. M.* 671.41 Gaisford (“You have poured a libation. Now drink streams of Pactolus”) are harder to interpret. Somebody (Heracles? Silenus? the satyrs?) may be temporarily frustrated from wine-drinking, but in isolation these fragments tell us little.¹⁴

Does Heracles have to wear a dress? The story that Omphale made Heracles exchange his lion skin and club for her garments was immensely popular in later times (see further below), but there is no compelling evidence for linking it with this play.¹⁵ Pechstein and Kru-
meich are attracted by the idea that 73* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F59 = Pollux 7.60 might belong here (“... clad in a short linen dress of mid-thigh length”, $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \mu\eta\rho\tilde{\nu}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\nu\ |\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$), but as they rightly point out, this may be more relevant to a scene of Lydian sympotic luxury.¹⁶ Lydian exoticism is certainly stressed in some of the fragments, as in 27 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F24 = Ath. 690b: “It is better to know *bakkaris* and perfumes, and the Sardis fashion in cosmetics, than the lifestyle in the Peloponnese”¹⁷ and 28 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F25 “and the black *stimmis*, which paints the eyes” (that is, kohl or mascara).¹⁸ All this could relate to an elaborate dressing-up scene in which Heracles is prepared for feasting Lydian-style, in a luxurious costume that looks more feminine than masculine, recalling the sympotic cross-dressing seen on some archaic and early classical Attic vases, with male drinkers

¹⁴ An alternative scenario might be suggested by Lada-Richards’ analysis (1999: 195–7) of the typically Heracleian perversion of the norms of feasting, seen in, for example, *Syleus*; in *Omphale* the point may be that he is ‘civilized’ by learning the Lydian style.

¹⁵ Lada-Richards (1999) 18–21, with figs. I.1 and I.2, following Vollkommer (1988), accepts two late fifth-century vases (*ARV*² 1134.7, London E370 and Staatliche Museen zu Berlin inv. 3414) as referring to the exchange, but does not specifically link them with the reception of Ion’s play.

¹⁶ *Satyrspiel* 487n21; cf. von Blumenthal (1939) 42.

¹⁷ $\beta\alpha\kappa\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \mu\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\ |\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \Sigma\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\nu\tilde{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\ \chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ |\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu\ \eta\ \tau\tilde{\omicron}\nu\ \Pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega\ \tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\pi\omicron\nu$. On *bakkaris*, a luxury unguent of some kind, cf. Ath. 690b, quoting Aeschylus’ *Amymone* F14 and Achaëus’ *Aithon* F10 (also *Satyrspiel* 93–4n9); the schol. on Aesch. *Pers.* 42 implies that the word is Lydian in origin. The text seems to preserve an Ionic accusative plural form $\beta\alpha\kappa\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$.

¹⁸ 28 Leurini = Ar. Byz. fr. 23 A–C Slater *ap.* Eust. 1761.31 (see also Pollux 5.101; Schol. Hom. Θ 545 (*Anecdota Parisina* 3.46.6–8 Cramer); Hdn. 2.767.20 Lentz; Choerob. *Gr. Gr.* 4.1.344.2); $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\eta\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\nu\ \sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\mu\iota\nu\ \omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\nu$. *Stimmis* is evidently a loan word from Egyptian: see Chantraine (1933); Slater (1986) 18.

wearing elegant gowns, and headbands or caps, and in some scenes shaded by parasols.¹⁹

Another exotic bit of vocabulary in 26b Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F23 = Ath. 634ce; Hsch. μ 3 evokes the atmosphere of the scene: “let the Lydian *magadis*-pipe lead the singing”.²⁰ The party evidently includes a lot of music, which takes us on to the chorus and the opportunities the play may have offered for virtuoso performance. Supposing that the satyrs, too, were slaves functioning as Omphale’s female servants,²¹ two fragments could be addressed to them by “Omphale: ‘Come maidens, bring out goblets and bossed wine cups’” (*mesomphalai*, playing, surely, on her name),²² and “Now you Lydian harpists, singers of ancient hymns, adorn (that is, ‘celebrate’) the guest”.²³ Heracles has come as a slave, but we might ask what he has done to deserve celebrity treatment, and if no external exploits are at issue, the action might turn on Omphale’s falling in love with him at some point. As for the chorus, if they too had arrived as slaves, this would give us the typical satyr-play scenario of a chorus diverted from (and no doubt ultimately restored to) its service of Dionysus. Song, dance and erotic games at the party would give the satyrs and Silenus (in their harp-girl costumes?) plenty of scope for displaying their performing skills.²⁴

The one element missing up to now is Dionysus, and one would like to see the Lydian context playing an important part: Lydian Mount Tmolus with its famous wine, and Lydian music and dancing, are all strongly associated, after all, with him and his worship. Do the celebrations change from being those of a secular *thiasos*²⁵ into those of a worshipping band of devotees? Does Heracles find his ‘true’ sympotic

¹⁹ Cf. Hoesch (1990).

²⁰ Λυδός τε μάγαδις αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς. But was it an *aulos* or a sort of lyre (as at Soph. *Thamyras* F238 and elsewhere)? See *Satyrspiel* for a summary of the discussion, which was already going strong in antiquity. West (1983b) 79 proposes an emendation to eliminate αὐλός.

²¹ *Satyrspiel* 488; von Blumenthal (1939) 42.

²² 25 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F20 = Ath. 501f; cf. Eust. 1261.24; Hsch. μ 923; Pollux 6.98: ἵτ’ ἐκφορεῖτε, παρθένοι, κύπελλα καὶ μεσομφάλους.

²³ 26a Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22 = Ath. 634ef: ἀλλ’ εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτραι, παλαιθέτων | ὕμνων ἀοιδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε.

²⁴ See most recently Seidensticker (2003) on satyric performance.

²⁵ 35 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F32 = Harpocr. s.v. θίασος; Phot. θ 180; Suda θ 380; [Zonar.] *Lex.* p.1045 Tittmann: the single word θίασος is cited by Harpocraton (s.v.) as being used by Ion in *Omphale* in the unusual sense of a gathering without a specific cultic purpose.

role, alongside his half-brother?²⁶ Does the god even appear in the play, to join the party and liberate his followers? This is where speculation has to stop, but it is still worth looking at the play in its wider context.

Intertextual References

The story of Heracles' killing of Iphitus and the penalty he paid for it was evidently familiar enough in the fifth century to be treated quite allusively, as it is (in very general terms) by Aeschylus at *Agamemnon* 1040–1, when Clytemnestra uses the example of Heracles' serving as a slave to admonish or 'reassure' Cassandra; but this could just as well refer to the Syleus story as to *Omphale*. Sophocles in *Trachiniae* makes three pointed references to Heracles' enslavement: the first, by Hyllus, when he is explaining Heracles' absence (69–70), refers to his service to a "Lydian woman" without naming her;²⁷ and the second, Lichas' résumé of the Iphitus story (248–57) which forms part of his disingenuous speech to Deianira, names *Omphale* and misleadingly implies that it was Heracles' resentment at the disgrace of enslavement that motivated his attack on Oechalia. The third mention comes at 356–7, when the Messenger explicitly contradicts Lichas. The story could gain ironic significance if it had intertextual resonance: as if Lichas were turning to other versions to help him concoct his own. If so, it would make more sense to think of Sophocles recalling Ion's *Eurytidai* and *Omphale* rather than Ion recalling Sophocles.²⁸ We have no significant evidence for the dating of *Trachiniae*, apart from the fact that it must post-date the *Oresteia* in 458, but both this play and *Omphale* could well have been staged sometime in the 440s or 430s.²⁹

The existence of another satyr play called *Omphale* by Ion's contemporary Achaëus is a further clue that the story was popular, and

²⁶ For the affinities between Dionysus and Heracles see Carpenter (1986) 177 and n83; Loraux (1990), especially p. 38; Lissarrague (1990), especially p. 112; Lada-Richards (1999) Chapter 1.

²⁷ Deianira's grim response at 71—"One could hear anything [sc. and believe it] if he was willing to endure that"—might be the nearest that a Sophoclean tragic character gets to a joke (but cf. possibly Theseus at *OC* 663). The theme of the invincible Heracles worsted by a woman (Deianira) is prominent in *Trach.* (see especially 1071–5 with 1062–3).

²⁸ So Webster (1936) 267, 274.

²⁹ For the date of *Trachiniae* see Easterling (1982) 19–23. See Maitland in this volume for more detailed parallels between *Omphale* and *Trachiniae*.

if Pechstein and Krumeich are correct it may have made an honorific reference to Ion's play.³⁰ *TrGF* 20 F35 consists of two words: Φανναῖος Ἀπόλλων, "Apollo of Phanai", which are elucidated by Hesychius (φ 141) as a cult title of Apollo used by the Chians. Phanai is a promontory on Chios where stood a temple of Apollo, which (so far as we know) played no part in the Heracles/Omphale story, except by association with Ion, particularly if he made reference to Heracles' consultation of Apollo's oracle at Delphi. There are not enough fragments surviving of Achaëus' play to suggest a scenario, beyond a chorus of satyrs who may be temporarily deprived of wine and the service of Dionysus and rescued by Heracles.³¹

Other contemporary echoes of Ion, equally tantalizing, are perhaps detectable in Cratinus F259 *PCG* and (less certainly) Eupolis F294 *PCG*. The crucial bit of evidence is unfortunately corrupt,³² but there seems to be no doubt that the comic poets drew parallels between Heracles and Omphale and Pericles and Aspasia. It would be interesting to know how to place this political satire: what sort of *femme fatale* was Omphale supposed to be?³³ And who first had the idea of linking Aspasia with her? Was there already a topical subtext in Ion's play, or was it the comedy writers who saw scope for political fun-making in his mythological fantasy? As for dates, we have nothing certain to work from, and these dramatists were all active during the same period, but the death of Pericles in 429/8 might be a factor to take into account: the identification was surely first made while he was still alive. The idea certainly ran and ran and could be adapted to other famous couples (see note 35).

Later Reception

By far the most popular motif in the story in later times was the tradition that Omphale made Heracles work as one of her maids, dressed as a

³⁰ *Satyrspiel* 539n1, 541n7, 542.

³¹ *Satyrspiel* 541–2.

³² This is a scholion on Pl. *Menex.* 235e, which reads Κρατίνος δὲ τὸ Ὀμφάλη τύραννον αὐτὴν καλεῖ χείρων Εὐπολὶς Φίλοις, continuing with references to other associations for Aspasia: Helen and Hera; cf. Plut. *Per.* 24.9. See Kassel-Austin on Cratinus F259 for this problematic text.

³³ Not, presumably, the sex-mad murderess of her guests and lovers imagined by Aristotle's pupil Clearchus (as reported by Ath. 515e–6c = fr. 43a Wehrli), which is quite alien to the rest of the tradition.

woman and spinning wool, while she wore his lionskin and carried his club. The situation has obvious erotic as well as grotesque possibilities, and it was evidently a favourite in art and literature.³⁴ Lucian's account illustrates both aspects: "You've no doubt seen pictures of Heracles dressed in a very strange style . . . in a woman's dress and purple wrap, carding wool and being smacked with Omphale's golden sandal" (*How to Write History* 10).³⁵ The Roman poets loved the idea and found exuberant ways of embroidering upon it.³⁶

The big question here is how far this motif goes back. It would be surprising, of course, if Ion's play had not used the theme of a sexual liaison between Heracles and Omphale, and the Omphale/Aspasia link certainly depends on the idea, but the exchange of garments, with Heracles in Omphale's dress (as opposed to Lydian sympotic dress) and Omphale as dominatrix, need not have figured. If Ion was not the originator, we might find clues in Middle Comedy: Antiphanes wrote an *Omphale* (FF174–176 *PCG*), and so did the younger Cratinus; there is very little evidence surviving, but both seem to have Heracles at a feast, and in Cratinus' play there is a line (F5 *PCG*) in which "you" (in the plural) may possibly be envisaged as wearing female dress.³⁷ Nicochares wrote a play in which Heracles may have been presented as a bride (*PCG* VII, 7). None of this adds up to much, but the artistic evidence becomes more frequent from the fourth century on, and there is a strong case for seeing a tradition of popular performance—satyr play, comedy, and, in due course, mime³⁸—lying behind some of the Roman and later Greek examples.³⁹

³⁴ For the artistic record see Boardman (1994); Vollkommer (1988); Schauenburg (1960), and for the Roman period, see Kampen (1996).

³⁵ Cf. Lucian *Dial. D.* 15. Plutarch, too, refers to pictures: in the *Comparison of Demetrius and Antony* he notes, "As for Antony, on the contrary, just as we see Omphale in paintings taking away Heracles' club and stripping off his lionskin, so Cleopatra often disarmed him . . ." (3).

³⁶ Cf. Prop. 3.11.17–20, 29ff.; 4.9.47–50; Ov. *Her.* 9.53–118; *Ars am.* 2.217–21; *Fast.* 2.303–58; Sen. *Her. Oet.* 371–7, with Fantham (1983) 192–201.

³⁷ Cratinus F5 *PCG*: ὑμεῖς δ' ἔαν ἱππίσκον ἢ τρίμιτον ἔχητε. Pollux (7.58), who quotes the line, says these are "types of little tunic"; Hesychius explains *hippiskos* as "headgear or female ornament" and *trimiton* as a closely-woven kind of himation. These details could of course be used to evoke Lydian luxury rather than exchange of garments.

³⁸ Jarcho (1987) discusses the possibility that the fragmentary mime preserved in *POxy* 3700 has Omphale as a madame in a brothel.

³⁹ The references to Hermes as the agent who brings the lovers together in Achilles Tatius 2.6.1–3 and Musaeus *Hero and Leander* 150–1 may suggest allusion to a motif first made famous in Ion's play.

Ovid's version in *Fasti* 2.303–58, introduced as an aetiology for the nakedness of worshippers at the Lupercalia, is the most inventive and entertaining account of the story, and the tone is set by the text itself at 304: *traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci* (“the tale is handed down full of old-style jesting”), which perhaps also gives a hint of its generic origin.⁴⁰ Ovid lays stress on the Lydian setting: “the grove of Bacchus and the vineyards of Tmolus” (313), where Heracles and Omphale were going to celebrate a festival of Bacchus. Faunus, spotting them as they made their way—Omphale the height of Lydian glamour, Heracles carrying her golden parasol—was smitten with longing for Omphale. Then follows the story of the exchange of garments, a feast, and Faunus' unfortunate mistake of getting into bed with the wrong partner. The narrative is made up of vignettes which could easily have been inspired by scenes in a mime or perhaps by a performance based on a merging of elements from mime and satyr play, of the kind that Wiseman has argued was popular at Rome.⁴¹ If this is the right sort of approach, there may have been a longer-running tradition of popular entertainment than our surviving texts can trace.

Conclusion

Neither the surviving fragments of Ion's play nor the rich later tradition of Heracles and Omphale—in performance and iconography—yield enough clues for a coherent story to be told. But new material does occasionally turn up, as with *POxy* 1611, which gave us what seems to be the opening of the play (22 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F17a), and scholars will certainly go on trying to make the most of whatever can be plausibly pieced together.⁴²

⁴⁰ Cf. Bömer (1957–58) *ad loc.* Littlewood (1975) 1063–7 sees a likely model in satyr plays; cf. Wiseman (2002b). See Fantham (1983) 192–201 for an important discussion of the whole scene.

⁴¹ Wiseman (2002b); cf., more generally, Wiseman (1988).

⁴² I am grateful to Elaine Fantham, Alan Griffiths, John Henderson and Simon Hornblower for comments and advice.

PART FIVE

ION THE PHILOSOPHER?

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

PLAYING THE PYTHAGOREAN: ION'S *TRIAGMOS*

HAN BALTUSSEN

Introduction

Was Ion of Chios a philosopher? As so often when one asks a seemingly simple question, the answer turns out to be complicated and—given that in this case the evidence is exiguous—inconclusive on most issues. This explains why my discussion regarding Ion as a philosopher is to a large extent exploratory and speculative. I intend to use other people's work in the process—in particular the articles by Huxley (1965), West (1985) and Dover (1986), of which the latter two appeared so close in time to each other that they are independent treatments. Nevertheless, my approach differs from all these. I examine Ion's status as a philosopher, an approach hitherto unexplored, by bringing into play all the evidence and providing a context. How one defines 'philosopher', in particular with reference to the early fifth century, where the term is still fairly fluid, is a natural corollary to my investigation. My answer to the question first posed above will be a qualified "yes", since the evidence suggests that Ion was knowledgeable about the subject, yet perhaps not completely serious while writing about it.

Research into the topic revealed that some of the earlier work (seeking answers to different questions) did not attempt to look for coherence in the surviving philosophical material. I believe that some of Huxley's speculations are over-confident and potentially misleading; West focuses more on the historical evidence; Dover's comments are mostly from a literary perspective, analyzing the stylistic features which characterize Ion's work. Regarding the *Triagmos*, Dover's analysis is beyond doubt the most helpful. However, the valuable comments of all three are taken into account.¹ Regarding any search for coherence, this will be

¹ Dover's analysis of the style and literary context remains unchallenged. My arguments are intended to be complementary to Dover and West, both still well worth consulting. The earliest literature has faded from the scholarly debate (see Diehl 1916),

the first attempt to study the intellectual context as well as assess the 'merit' (if any) of Ion's extant philosophical fragments.

The importance of a synoptic discussion of all philosophical fragments which provides a meaningful context to, and exegesis of, Ion's contribution in this area is immediately obvious, particularly when we appreciate the extent of his philosophical output.² While there is very little left, what remains provokes many stimulating questions. In particular, I focus on the work with the intriguing and puzzling title *Triagmos* ('Triad'?), printed in Diels and Kranz's *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (= 36A-B DK).³ It has been suggested that the role of the number three indicates that Ion had Pythagorean leanings. After looking at the evidence more closely, I shall explore the Pythagorean connection by discussing what we know about early Pythagoreanism. Next, on the basis of the fragmentary evidence, I shall consider the extent to which Ion can be linked to Pythagoras or his followers.

It is, in other words, our task to see if there is any philosophical meat in the meagre remains of his work. I shall concentrate on two questions in a deliberately discursive treatment of the fragmentary evidence: (1) What is Ion's connection with philosophy, in particular Pythagoreanism? (2) What can we say about the work *Triagmos*? The specific focus on this work arises simply because it is his only philosophical work on record. Here, the meaning of the title deserves further scrutiny. Both these questions will also draw us towards other relevant issues, and, collectively, they should be of some help in clarifying Ion's contribution to philosophy.

The Evidence for his Philosophical Writing(s)

Our knowledge of Ion's philosophical output amounts to four B-numbered fragments in Diels-Kranz (DK),⁴ but this paucity of evidence does

which is not always for the better. For a good introductory summary of sources, and Ion's role in it, see von Blumenthal (1939) 3–4.

² Brisson (2000) goes some way to synthesise, but is restricted by the format of the encyclopaedic lemma.

³ 114–119 Leurini = 20–25 von Blumenthal. It can also be found in a one page section in Barnes' overview of early Greek philosophy in the Penguin Classics (1987): 223, cf. pp. 82–3 (in the section on Pythagoras).

⁴ In order not to overcomplicate the discussion with side-issues, I will use the terms 'fragments' [F] and 'testimonia' [T] in the sense of Diels-Kranz where 'fragment'

not render our scrutiny futile: there are actually ten short texts and a further six A-fragments (testimonia), apart from other connections one might make with the 'literary' evidence.⁵ At least one source is happy to call Ion a philosopher (φιλόσοφος; T4 Leurini = 36A3 DK = Suda s.v. Ion Chios, ι 487; see also *TEXT 1*, below), so we are invited to take his status in this area seriously, even if he is more often labelled a "tragedian". Isocrates mentions him next to Empedocles in a list of παλαιῶν σοφιστῶν, "experts of old", as his exemplars of those who explain the world through a limited number of elements (114 Leurini = 36A6 DK [first text] = *Antid.* 268). The use of the term *sophistes* is rather broad here—it was used of musicians, poets and the Seven Sages (for example, Hdt. 1.29, who, interestingly, also uses it of Pythagoras at 4.95), and does not necessarily have the pejorative meaning it acquired after both Plato and Aristotle had put their spin on the history of rhetoric and education. Moreover, Isocrates is in fact counting him among the *natural philosophers*, so *sophistes* may be no more than the equivalent of an "expert" in some area.

The opening lines in fragment 36B1 illustrate Ion's reputation as a versatile author. I shall quote this passage almost in full, because of its considerable importance (hereafter referred to as *TEXT 1*):

Ἴων... ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ μέλη πολλὰ καὶ τραγωδίας καὶ φιλόσοφόν τι σύγγραμμα τὸν Τριαγμὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον, ὅπερ Καλλιμάχος ἀντιλέγεσθαι φησιν ὡς Ἐπιγένους. ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ πληθυντικῶς ἐπιγράφεται Τριαγμοί, καθὰ Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος καὶ Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεὺς. ἀναγράφουσι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τάδε, λέγει, ἀρχὴ μου τοῦ λόγου· πάντα τρία καὶ πλεον τοῦδε πλείω οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἐλάσσω τούτων τῶν τριῶν· ἕνος ἐκάστου ἀρετὴ τριάς, σύνεσις καὶ κράτος καὶ τύχη.

Ion: he composed many lyric poems and tragedies and some kind of philosophical treatise entitled *Triad* ("Triagmos"). Callimachus says that its authorship is disputed, and in some copies it is entitled *Triads*, in the

(label B) is an alleged direct quotation, while 'testimonia' (label A) are indirect reports on the author, sometimes providing paraphrase of his words. For comments on why this way of editing fragments is no longer viable, see Laks (1998), Burkert (1999) and Baltussen (1999), (2000). For a problem in the current DK division, see below *TEXT 4* and conclusion.

⁵ I shall make some comments along the way in order to connect his literary and philosophical activities, although Diels is probably right that Ion's tragedies have no philosophical content ("enthaltien... nichts Philosophisches": p. 380 DK, ll. 6–8); in the lyric poems he discerns some verbal parallels with Empedocles (discussed further below). Therefore, it is worth asking to what extent the poetic output expresses views (implicitly or explicitly) that coincide with his philosophical outlook. See West (1985) 76.

plural (according to Demetrius of Scepsis and Apollonides of Nicaea).⁶ They record in it the following: he says “This is the beginning of my account. All things are three (τρία), and there is nothing more or less than these three. Of each one thing the excellence (ἀρετή) is a triad (τριάς), intelligence and power and fortune”.

(T9a, 114 Leurini = DK 36A1, B1 = *FGrH* 392 T3, F24a = Harpocration s.v. Ion)⁷

Four points are significant in this passage. First, Harpocration tells us how prolific a writer Ion was. He organizes the writings in a peculiar order: lyric poems (or songs), tragedies, “a philosophical treatise”.⁸ Secondly, for this last work he uses the (rather technical) term *sungramma* which means a prose work with systematic content, and what is more important, he provides a title.⁹ We may here observe that the adjective φιλόσοφον indicates that *sungramma* needs a specification, implying that it could be used for other types of works. Moreover, the indefinite pronoun (τι) leaves us with the impression that Harpocration (or his source) did not quite know what it was about. Other titles exist (*Kosmologikos*, *Peri meteoron*), and these probably refer to one and the same work (see further below).¹⁰ Thirdly, we are immediately made aware of the importance of the number three—an obvious Pythagorean trademark (see *TEXT 2a* below).

However, on the basis of this text, we have very little to go on to understand Ion’s motive for choosing this numerical theory, nor is it

⁶ Apollonides, a grammarian in the time of Tiberius, wrote a commentary on Timon’s *Silloi* (D. L. 9.109), a “Spurious Inquiry”, and on proverbs: see *RE* 2 (1896), no. 29, cols. 120–1.

⁷ Tr. Barnes (1987), slightly modified. Harpocration was a grammarian working in Alexandria (dates unknown, perhaps Imperial period). He wrote a *Lexicon* on rhetorical authors “designed as an aid to reading, not to composition” (*OCD*² s.v., 488). The Greek text, which is rather corrupt, is that of Huxley (1965) 39, who emends Diels’ οὐδεν πλέον ἢ ἐλάσσον into οὐδεν οὐδέ ἐλάσσω—accepted by, for example, Brisson (2000).

⁸ Contrast T8 Leurini = 36A2 DK = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835: dithyrambs, tragedy and lyric poems; and the T4 Leurini = 36A3 DK = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios, ι 487: tragedian, lyric poet, philosopher. On this ordering, see Henderson in this volume.

⁹ I emphasize this because Harpocration seems to offer the earliest reference to this title: he quotes Demetrius of Scepsis (born c. 214 BC) and Apollonides. This ‘title’ is found in several other sources, on which see my comments further below. For *sungramma* see LSJ s.v., but compare Dorandi (1991) who (in another context) distinguishes it from *hypomnema* (a work-form also attributed to Ion, in T8 Leurini = 36A2 DK = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835).

¹⁰ Thus already Diehl (1916) 1862: “Kosmologikos identisch mit Triagmos”. That Ion was in good company by writing a *peri meteoron* can be gathered from precedents: see Thales 11A2 DK (*Suda*); Epicurus *Ep. Hdt.* (D. L. 10.78); Diogenes of Apollonia 64A4 DK.

clear how the number three would actually function. One might perhaps paraphrase further the phrase “is a triad” (last line): for example, by saying that the excellence (*arete*: virtue? quality?) of all things *consists* in or *requires* three aspects; but one would still want to know how this informs us about the *scope* of the number three in his overall theory.¹¹ Ion’s word selection—“no less and no more than three”—may seem redundant, yet within a more oral and competitive culture it is the kind of emphatic statement which further underscores the position: it is not mere repetition, but reinforcement and sharpening up of the main point. In other words, it gives the number three a universal role by emphatically excluding other options. I shall say a bit more on this point below.

Fourthly, as Dover rightly points out,¹² this kind of opening statement, with its generalizing and dogmatic tone, fits in well with some of the earliest prose works known from the Presocratics; here we may compare some of the other rare prose authors like Heraclitus, Diogenes of Apollonia and the Pythagorean Pherecydes. These parallels, also mentioned by Dover for their contrasting importance, seem even more revealing by their differences rather than their similarities. Heraclitus famously makes a bold general statement: “of this account (*logos*) which holds forever men prove uncomprehending...” (22B1 DK). But Diogenes of Apollonia (late fifth century BC) is closer in style and wording to Ion. It is reported that Diogenes wrote a prose treatise (σύγγραμμα) which started thus:

λόγου παντὸς ἀρχόμενον δοκεῖ μοι χρεὼν εἶναι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀναμφισβήτητον παρέχεσθαι, τὴν δ’ ἐρμηνείαν ἀπλήν καὶ σεμνήν.

It seems to me that a person who begins an account must needs supply a starting point which is indisputable, the expression [of it] simple and dignified. (64B1 DK = D. L. 9.57)

Diogenes of Apollonia here provides a methodological preface which stands out because it makes a claim *about* the starting point (itself not yet stated), insisting it be securely grounded (content) and appropriately

¹¹ For example, is “each thing” then another way of saying “all things”, or perhaps even an intensifier? This particular use of “to be” is unclear and, as we now tend to say, typically pre-Aristotelian in that it fails to distinguish between its possible usages as a copula (for predication: “X is such and such”), as truth statement (“X is true”), or as existential (“X is” = “X exists”). See Kahn (1973).

¹² Dover (1986) 28.

formulated (form). Only then does he proceed to make the actual statement of his position, in which a similarly universal claim is made about the world and everything in it (τὸ μὲν ξύμπαν...πάντα τὰ ὄντα, “all existing things...are the same thing”: 64B2 DK = Simplicius in *Phys.* 151.31; cf. similar in Pherecydes).¹³ Since this is a more sophisticated and stylized way of presenting a theoretical view—showing an awareness of audience and public debate—I take it to be of a later date than Ion.¹⁴

In sum, what we have for Ion is just one philosophical prose work, which fits the style of early cosmological explanations, and which for its title, format and content depends on a handful of brief references and remarks. As I shall consider the title (if it is that) last, let us briefly focus on the other two points. Regarding format, we are dealing with a very early prose work,¹⁵ intent on positioning itself within the Presocratic milieu, with a strong Pythagorean flavour. It is of considerable interest to note (a) the combination of cosmology and qualitative (ethical?) concerns; (b) a number used as an explanatory factor; (c) the link between the human domain and fortune (see *TEXT 1* above). These features move his position closer to Pythagoreanism. It is, after all, not such a bizarre idea to try to establish mankind’s role in the world by analyzing both humans and the world as well as their interaction. Early Greek thought deals with that complexity of issues within the traditional religious framework, and it is clearly a Pythagorean innovation to produce a more abstract causal account (for example, harmony of the spheres) to bring them even closer together. Therefore, we are certainly justified in looking in that direction for further clarification of Ion’s position, and some context will be crucial for a better understanding of the meagre evidence.

¹³ Pherecydes: see the useful discussion in Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983) 51–70.

¹⁴ Cf. Dover (1986) 29. Note, however, that the quoted sentence is not the actual opening of the work, if we are to believe Simplicius who introduces it with the remark, “immediately after the *prooimion* he writes the following...” (in *Phys.* 151.28). In the *apparatus* to 36B1 (p. 379) DK compare Hippoc. *Virg.* 1 and *Art.* 4, which also emphasize the undisputed nature of the claims to come.

¹⁵ It was one among several prose works. Cf. his *Chiou Ktisis*, which West (1985: 74) claims “must at all events count as the earliest prose work of its kind that has left any record”, and the *Epidemiai*. For early *philosophical* prose that survives, we know of works by Heraclitus c. 500 BC (D. L. 9.5), Anaximander c. 550 BC (D. L. 2.1–2), and Pherecydes c. 600–540 BC—possibly the earliest prose book of Greek philosophy (D. L. 1.116).

Early Pythagoreanism

No ancient source refers to Ion as a Pythagorean: labels used are philosopher, tragedian, sophist, poet. Yet the evidence points to such a link, as we have already seen, and Ion talks *about* Pythagoras twice (92 Leurini = 36B4 DK = 30 West = D. L. 1.120; 116 Leurini = 36B2 [texts 1–2] DK = D. L. 8.8, Clem. Al. *Str.* 1.131). These scraps of evidence give some indication of where his interests lie. How much of Pythagoreanism was known to Ion as a citizen of Chios, an island close to Samos (Pythagoras' birthplace), is impossible to know. We think Pythagoras (c. 570–480) probably left for South Italy around 530, and it is there that his ideas first made a significant impact.

Because our knowledge of early Pythagoreanism of the sixth and early fifth centuries is insubstantial,¹⁶ let us consider two authors who exhibit the well-established influence of the Pythagoreans in the late-fifth and early fourth centuries, namely Plato and Aristotle. Late in his life, Plato wrote his *Timaeus*, a cosmological masterpiece named after a Pythagorean astronomer from Italy. It begins thus: “One, two, three”—a count of those present, but also a playful way of introducing one of the main themes of the work, the orderly structure of the universe in which numbers (especially the number three) play a major role. In it we find the harmony of the spheres in mathematical detail, the “triangular relation” of elements,¹⁷ and the so-called “third factor” or Receptacle, a spatial entity which mediates between (ideal) forms and (concrete) objects, allowing them to have a presence in the visible world.¹⁸

Aristotle usually criticizes the number theory as applied to the physical world, but his understanding of the theory has proved to be a distortion of the view of Philolaus, not Pythagoras or *the* Pythagoreans in

¹⁶ See especially Huffman (1999) for further literature.

¹⁷ The number three occurs in several places, but among the most significant are: (1) its symbolic role in the binding of world soul and the elements, in which (significantly in *Timaeus*) two things require a third to be connected (*Tim.* 31bc, 35ab, 36c); (2) in the triangles that constitute the ‘building blocks’ (surfaces) of the basic elements (triangles and squares) to form air, fire, water and earth (*Tim.* 52–58).

¹⁸ Belief in the special and symbolic value of numbers seems to be perennial. We still say things like “good things (or bad) come in threes”, “third time lucky”. There is something about the number three which is intriguing: for instance, counting up to three is the minimum required to enable a hearer to calculate fairly accurately when something will happen, and thus quantify his or her level of expectation.

general.¹⁹ Pythagoras himself had, in fact, little to say on cosmology, and is known best for his vast knowledge, religious outlook, shamanism (transmigration of souls) and practical ethics.²⁰ Therefore, when we focus on the specific clue to Ion's link with Pythagoreanism, the number three, we should make a connection with his contemporary Philolaus (born c. 470). Aristotle gives us a good indication of the importance of three in Pythagorean philosophy (*TEXT 2a* = Arist. *Cael.* 268a10–12):

... as the Pythagoreans say as well, *the universe and all things in it* (τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὰ πάντα) *are determined by the number three* (τοῖς τρισὶν), since end, middle and beginning give the number of the universe, and the number they give is that of the triad (τὸν τῆς τριάδος). (tr. Barnes, modified)

As so often with selective quotation and fragments, the context, which is left unexplored by Diels or Huxley, offers further information and thus deserves to be taken into account. Aristotle adds a further clarification of the Pythagorean position, which arises while he is discussing the subject matter of the science of nature—bodies and magnitude. Elaborating on the latter, he takes the Pythagoreans to mean that the “three” refers to “the three dimensions”, and he elucidates how this is a means of giving a comprehensive account of the physical world (*TEXT 2b* = Arist. *Cael.* 268a7–9):

Magnitude divisible in one direction is a line, in two directions a surface, in three directions a body. *There is no magnitude not included in these; for three are “all”, and “in three ways” is the same as “in all ways”.* It is just as the Pythagoreans say [*TEXT 2a* follows]... (tr. Guthrie, with my italics)

Remarkably, Aristotle seems here to agree with this position,²¹ with a pre-emptory statement which anticipates a reference to the Pythagoreans, perhaps even playing on words when he uses the word “is defined” (ὁρίζεται, 268a11), which obviously also means “circumscribes”,

¹⁹ See Kahn (1974) 163ff. and Huffman (1999) 82–3; cf. p. 69 where he notes that we have in fact “more precise evidence for Philolaus than for Pythagoras himself”.

²⁰ Huffman (1999) 68, who, with reference to Burkert's analysis, stresses the importance of distinguishing Pythagoras from the Pythagorean tradition.

²¹ Simplicius already expressed a similar remark in the early sixth century AD: “It is worth noting that Aristotle has uncharacteristically made use of Pythagorean proofs (*endeixis*) in the service of demonstration (*apodeixis*)” (*On Aristotle On the Heavens I*, p. 9.10–11 Hankinson). His point is thus twofold, as Hankinson (2002) *ad loc.*, n48 clarifies: “The argument is uncharacteristic, not only because Aristotle rarely has much favorable to say for the Pythagoreans, but rather [sic] because this sort of appeal to plausibility has no place in a properly-organized science (see *Top.* 1.1)”.

“includes”.²² On the basis of this strong link between “three” and “all”, the role of the number “three” is almost given the status of “laws of nature” (cf. ὥσπερ νομοὺς ἐκείνῃ [sc. φύσῃ], 268a14), to be found also, Aristotle reminds his audience, in religious rituals.²³

Therefore, it is the use of three in relation to spatial dimensions, which make it “all-encompassing”, since there are no dimensions over and above the three listed. Though a perfectly acceptable interpretation of the Pythagorean view, one may well wonder if this is what the Pythagoreans had in mind.

This leaves us with the remark about “the beginning, middle and end” (*TEXT 2a* above). Simplicius (c. AD 530) gives us further help in his commentary on *De caelo* by reporting a Pythagorean argument to clarify the point on the three dimensions (*TEXT 2c* = *Simpl. in Cael.* p. 8.23–27):

...this the Pythagoreans showed as follows: the totality has beginning, middle and end, and as such is delimited by the triad. And perhaps we say of the totality that it is complete on account of its having beginning, middle, and end. For what is not a totality lacks something by comparison with the totality, and it is incomplete.

This information is not found in Aristotle, and one suspects Simplicius may have used Alexander of Aphrodisias (AD 200) on this issue, since he goes on to discuss the latter's argument (p. 8.28ff.). Whatever the origin, it is clear how the Pythagorean position *can* be interpreted, if one wonders exactly how the all-encompassing role of the triad is to function: “beginning, middle and end” is one way of saying “everything”, and within the context of physics Aristotle re-interprets it, plausibly and more concretely, as the three dimensions.

Returning to Ion now, it is obvious that he is less detailed in his claim, though not less ambitious in scope: by stating that “all things are three, and nothing is either more or less than those three”, he makes the number three all important and omnipresent. As astutely

²² In this context, it could be related to Philolaus' view that the universe started with things that are “unlimited” and things that are “limiting”, which he says apply to “both the world-order as a whole and all the things in it” (44B1 DK).

²³ Guthrie (1939) 5 (note *f*) mentions Stengel (1920) for more on the religious practice. In *De caelo* Aristotle also brings in common usages of linguistic expression to support the connection between “three” and “all”: “Our language too shows the same tendency, for of two things or people we say ‘both’, not ‘all’. This latter term we first employ when there are three in question; and in behaving thus, as I have said, we are accepting nature herself as our guide” (268a16–18, tr. Guthrie).

recognized by Dover (1986: 29), the second sentence (“of each one thing the excellence is a triad, intelligence and power and fortune”) creates a problem for an ancient reader. Should the first part be taken to refer also to basic elements of the universe, as is common in cosmological works? Here we might ponder whether there is a connection with another fragment in which Ion is said to have chosen fire, earth and water as principles of nature (115* Leurini = 36A6 DK [second text] = Philop. *De gen. et corr.*, p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli). This is, however, not quite clear from the statement. The claim would also imply that both the animate and inanimate are included. If correct, this creates the further puzzle (also in Dover 1986: 29) of how to grasp the implication that fortune, skill *and* understanding (*sunesis*) are present in both these spheres of existence. Dover rejects this possibility outright (p. 29): “although there are circumstances in which inanimates could be regarded as having power (κράτος) and fortune (τύχη), they do not have understanding (συνέσις)”.

This idea—that understanding has a universal presence in the world—may not be as far-fetched as he assumes. If we consider the kind of view held by Empedocles, an admirer and follower of Pythagoras, or when we think of Anaxagoras and Diogenes, who made “mind” all-pervasive in the universe, there is some room for manoeuvring (see West 1985: 76, and my note 24). Empedocles’ view that all things in the world had sensation and understanding in them comes from a reliable source (Simpl. *in Phys.* 331.10 = 31B103 DK): “and one may find many such statements to bring in from Empedocles’ *Physics* such as this: ‘all things are capable of thought through the will of *Tyche*’”.²⁴ Given the close links of both authors to Pythagoreanism²⁵—and note *tyche*—Ion could have held a similar view.

²⁴ For sensation see also 31B102 DK (= Theophr. *Sens.* 21): “thus everything has received breathing and smells”. Ion’s proximity to Empedocles may be further supported by verbal echoes found in 68* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F53f = 36B3b DK = Photius α 3262 and an elegiac poem (see next note).

²⁵ See, for example, 31A7 DK (= Simpl. *in Phys.* 25.19, quoting Theophrastus; tr. Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983) 281 [no. 335]): “[Empedocles] was an emulator and associate of Parmenides, and even more of the Pythagoreans...”; and 31A11 DK (= Athenaeus 3e [DK wrongly 5e], tr. Gulick): “a Pythagorean and abstainer from living beings”. Dover (1986) 31 notes that the phrase used by Ion for Dionysus—καλῶν ἐπιήρανε ἔργων, “‘achiever’... of actions which we find attractive or admirable” (89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d; tr. Dover)—strongly resembles Empedocles’ description of Pythagoras as σοφῶν ἐπιήρανος ἔργων, “‘achiever’... of actions which reveal wisdom, skill, understanding” (31B129.3; tr. Dover). Cf. note 33.

Nevertheless, to say with Dover (1986: 29) that it is “possible to reconcile the opening of the *Triagmos* with the attribution to Ion of a three-element theory”, requires some qualification. Given that the second part of fragment 36B1 DK (*TEXT 1* above) shifts the attention to evaluative terms and ethics (excellence, intelligence), it is not likely that he was referring to three elements in this particular statement. This is not to say that he did not have a three-element theory: rather, the first fragment presents the overall philosophical position, in the style of Presocratic thinkers, whereas the information on the three elements must reflect the core of his ‘*Physics*’. Isocrates and Philoponus, most likely following their source, would only be reproducing an existing list. Separate from physics is ethics, no doubt the more important level of his ‘system’, in which *arete* is described as something arranged *structurally*, which could also “be predicated of entities other than persons” (Dover 1986: 29). Therefore, I would prefer to think of the *triad* and the three elements as manifestations of the same fundamental idea of “threeness”, the one a global, over-arching law, the other a concrete and area-specific feature of the physical world.²⁶ As mentioned above, this would concur with the Pythagorean perspective of making an effort to describe—crudely put—the world (physics) and mankind’s role within it (ethics). In sum, Dover’s statement only holds in the qualified sense that Ion was talking about the three elements indirectly.

Ion’s Pythagoreanism: Real, Partial or Imagined?

Thus far, we have found a number of indications which position Ion sufficiently close to Pythagoreanism. What else can we learn from the sources to assess Ion’s allegiance to the Pythagorean perspective? Pythagoras crops up in several places. We know Ion spoke highly of Pythagoras (92 Leurini = 36B4 DK = 30 West = D. L. 1.120) and it is a plausible suggestion²⁷ that he was attempting to rehabilitate Pythagoras after some of the criticism from, for example, Heraclitus, who disparagingly refers to his knowledge as *polymathia* and *kakotechnia*

²⁶ The emphasis on “each one thing” might imply there is no room for a global, over-arching law, but on balance it would seem that Ion expressed the universality of his view *via* each individual constituent of the world.

²⁷ Huxley (1965) 40.

(22B129 DK = D. L. 8.6). Yet the only other fragment which is explicitly allocated to the *Triagmos* (116(I) Leurini = 36B2 DK [second text] = Clem. Al. *Str.* 1.131) mentions Pythagoras as having written certain works which (Ion claims) he then attributed to Orpheus. Such a remark is far from unambiguous, and, as Dover suggests (1986: 31), could be a stab at the great man's credibility (disputed authorship). In 92 Leurini = 36B4 DK = 30 West = D. L. 1.120 a further doubt is cast on his intentions, when he is reported to have said that Pherecydes must be living a good life after death, if (εἴπερ) Pythagoras was right. My paraphrase of this passage is rather crude, because the text is far more ambiguous, and again, Dover is illuminating. He emphasizes that εἴπερ has sceptical overtones, veering towards "if indeed" rather than having the force of a neutral conditional. Callimachus' report on the disputed authorship for the *Triagmos* (see *TEXT I*) is but another twist of fate that has befallen Ion.

Another piece of information may be relevant. Aristotle mentions a man by the name of Xuthus (*Phys.* 4.9; see 33 DK), while discussing whether there is void in the universe. From the context, we can infer that he is talking about the view of "some thinkers", and Xuthus is mentioned as an example. He seems to have argued that if there were no void (empty space) that the universe would either not have any movement or it would "bulge" or "rise in waves" (κυμάνει τὸ ὅλον) as a result of the processes of rarification and condensation (expansion and contraction of water and gases). This is not a clear-cut Pythagorean view. Huxley (1965: 38) considers whether this might be Ion's father, who could have been a Pythagorean. The evidence for this is scant, but cannot readily be dismissed.²⁸ It is likely that natural philosophy and cosmology were known to him from his youth: Chios and Samos are relatively close geographically, and we know of other famous Chians working in the sciences.²⁹

More important still is Ion's ethical stance, since ethics is the area in which Pythagoras gained his reputation. In 114 Leurini = 36A6 DK = *Antid.* 268, Isocrates refers to Ion in the context of presenting Pythagoras

²⁸ One source is Harpocration (*TEXT I*); the other source is the fourth century AD Neoplatonist Iamblichus (*VP* 267) who names Buthus in a list of Pythagoreans from Croton (South Italy)—a possible corruption of Xuthus? Huxley (1965) 38–9 leaves it at that.

²⁹ Huxley (1965) 39: the mathematician Hippocrates and the astronomer Eunopides of the fifth century BC.

as an example of high morals. Pythagoras is famous for establishing a community which adhered to high standards of moral behaviour. He outlined rules for proper diet, right actions, clothing, etc., through which the Pythagoreans came to be regarded as a sect. Such a strong interest in ethical matters, in particular in the structure of goodness, is present in our *TEXT 1* (36B1 DK), and confirmed in Plutarch (*TEXT 3* = 118* Leurini = 36B3 DK = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d [cf. *Quaest. conv.* 717b]; on which, see also Pelling in this volume):

Ion the poet, in the work he wrote without metre and in prose, says that fortune, although a thing most dissimilar to wisdom (σοφία), produces very similar effects. (tr. Barnes)

Here we find an interesting observation which compares “fortune” and “wisdom” (Barnes 1987: 223) or “skill” (Dover 1986: 29): the focus of this comment, stating that fortune and wisdom may be different in some ways, but produce similar *effects*, points to the kind of reflection upon the relation between cause and effect, and the fact that similar outcomes may have different causes. In this case, the spheres of fortune and skill/wisdom can almost be read as “destiny” and “human endeavour” respectively, or perhaps as “accidental events” *versus* “intentional (willed) results”. Whether this means Ion wants to convey a sense of resignation, or whether he intends his audience to think harder about what humans are capable of, is not easily determined.

We should not overlook the influence of early Greek (‘Ionian school’) philosophy on Pythagoras’ approach to nature. Kahn (1974: 170) is no doubt right that Pythagoras was familiar with the Ionian thinkers before he left Samos. He has become known as the first Greek thinker to combine ‘mathematical abstraction’ to a high degree in analyzing the world.³⁰ In short, these three components—ethics, cosmology and number-theory—can be said to have produced Pythagorean philosophy.

Significant in the ethical guidelines, which are mostly found in short maxims called *akousmata*, is that they often fail to provide the rationale for their existence—which is perhaps why some categorize them as riddles (Ath. 452d). They were probably committed to memory, contained mostly rules of abstinence and prohibitions, ranging from the injunction not to eat beans, cocks and certain fish to such prohibitions as “do not poke the fire with a sword” (that is, do not provoke an angry man) or

³⁰ A move which he allegedly made after noticing that metal pieces of different length produce different sounds (Xenocrates fr. 9 Heinze).

“do not sit on the corn ration” (live not in idleness: see Kirk, Raven and Schofield 1983, no. 276). No doubt the gnomic style is partly due to oral culture since it contributes to easy memorization.

Next, there is the importance of number theory and the harmony of the heavenly spheres which are probably well-known. I note especially four specific maxims to illustrate the number symbolism:³¹

- the source of wisdom is the *tetractys*;
- the wisest is number, second is the man who assigned names to things;
- the wisest thing in our power is medicine;
- the most powerful is knowledge.

These alert us to certain concepts which were highly valued, and how they came to be expressed in number theory. This theory takes its starting point in the *tetractys*, the set of four first digits (1, 2, 3, 4) which, when added up, produce ten, the number referred to as “perfect” or “complete” (both senses expressed in the Greek word *τελείος*), since it “includes” *all* numbers. Here we are back at the general claim of Ion’s philosophy as discussed above (*TEXT 1*). It is easy to see how the aspect of comprehensiveness and perfection implied in the number 10 became associated in Pythagorean cosmology with the whole *cosmos*, the All. These are roughly the main features which may account for the potential appeal of this system. It was ambitiously comprehensive, ethically sound, and (in some sense) wonderfully explanatory.

Ion might have found appeal in such a system, given his cosmological and ethical statements, but doubts remain as to how successful his foray into philosophical territory is. One fragment related to cosmology might seem somewhat naïve (*TEXT 4* = 117* Leurini = 36A7 DK = *Dox. Gr.* 356b21 = Aët. *Plac.* 2.25.11):

[About the essence of the moon]. §11. Ion: a body (σῶμα) partly of a translucent shiny nature (ὑελοειδὲς διανγές), partly dark (“lightless”, ἀφεγγές).

The doxographer, in his list of opinions of natural philosophers, includes Ion in a lemma on the “essence of the moon”: these philosophers were arranged in such a way that they range from viewing the moon as “pure fire” to “an earthlike substance which can be hot or cool” in

³¹ Iambl. *VP* 82 = 58C4 DK. Translated in Kirk, Raven and Schofield (1983) no. 277.

a more or less logical progression.³² Ion has been incorporated among the Ionians who regard it as bodily, after Thales (§8: *geode*), Anaxagoras and Democritus (§9: *stereoma*), and Diogenes (§10: *anamma*, “ignited mass”). Ion’s observation on the moon as partly “translucent shiny”³³ and partly “dark” only makes sense when explaining a full moon, if we suppose that it is like a marble, half shiny, half opaque, so that by rotating it would seem to us to change its shape progressively, thus producing the four quarters. At any rate, a far more striking point is that the word for “lightless” (ἀφεγγής) is also found in Sophocles (*OC* 1481, 1549), whom he knew personally,³⁴ and that “shiny” (διαυγής) is a term used by the Pythagorean Philolaus to describe the sun (*Aët. Plac.* 2.20.12 = 44A19 DK). The latter occurrence speaks in favour of the term as authentic, and may imply that the text ought to be a ‘B’ fragment, not an ‘A’ testimonium. These are further examples of Ion’s allusive and creative style which associates him with both tragedy and philosophy. Such a creative use of language can be further illustrated

³² Runia (1989) 254. Runia’s analysis is particularly useful for understanding the way in which Diels has reconstructed the Aetian lemmata from two texts: Pseudo-Plutarch (date unknown) and Stobaeus (c. AD 500). Ion is only to be found in the Stobaeus part of the text: Diels (1879) 356, ll. 21–22.

³³ There is a temptation to translate ὑελοειδές as “glasslike” (for example, LSJ referring to Galen, second century AD), but this could be misleading (as my colleague Dr. Margaret O’Hea, an expert in ancient glass, points out to me), because glass before the Hellenistic period was never fully transparent in the way that Roman or modern glass can be. She writes, “The Neo-Assyrians and the Achaemenid Persians after them did produce transparent and colourless glass, but most Greeks would never have seen one of these, not even a Perikles—even Alkibiades didn’t have glass vessels in the forced sale of his confiscated goods, and Persian bowls, though they appear in Greek graves, are scarce as hens’ teeth (a couple over two centuries). Greek glass was normally so strongly coloured (and small-scale) that even though translucent, it would appear opaque, but not matte. The glass vessels dedicated on the Akropolis were probably such as these. My point would be that the term ‘glass-like’ to a classical Greek would have been more likely a reference to something very shiny and bright—no coincidence that the eyes of cult statues were normally made of coloured glass at this time, and gods’ eyes were flashing/bright” (personal communication, January 2004). See also Weinberg and McClellan (1992) 21f. and especially Stern (1997) [I owe these references to Dr. O’Hea].

³⁴ See the anecdote from his *Epidemiai* quoted in Athenaeus (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d). I note that Ion, in *Omphale* (27 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F24 = Ath. 690b), also shared a word for a certain perfume (βάκκαρις) with Sophocles (and Aeschylus), and he seems to echo Euripides’ ἀερίγυιον (“limb-lifter”) by his ἀερίνοος (“lifting the spirit”, said of wine: 86* Leurini = 744 *PMG* = Ath. 35de; see Gulick *ad* Ath. 446b). Less convincing is Athenaeus’ suggestion that, in *Omphale*, Ion borrowed the descriptive elements used of a glutton from Pindar (fr. 168b Snell-Maehler): 31 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F29 = Ath. 411b.

by his interest in inventing compound words reminiscent of Homeric language.³⁵ His view on the physical principles of the universe, referred to by Philoponus, is straightforward, and earned him a place in a convenient scheme of an increasing number of elements.³⁶ But this seems the extent of his—for us observable—fame as a natural philosopher: Philoponus refers to him by the (no doubt traditional) title “Ion the tragedian”.

So let us return to our main question, now in more specific form: *is Ion a Pythagorean in his use of the number three?* The way in which he uses it (structural analysis of virtue) and the abstract level at which it operates (applied to the animate and inanimate as well as concepts) are good indicators for such a view. One can sympathize with (and perhaps marvel at) the ingenious intuition that number can somehow be used to reach an abstract understanding of certain concrete aspects of reality, but it is pressing it too far to say that numbers can generate physical things (Aristotle), given that they themselves are not physical. There is present, however, a palpably distinct position which allows us to say that, for Ion, Pythagoreanism is more a source of inspiration than a matter of strict allegiance.

One aspect may still justify drawing him closer to the Pythagorean doctrine, and that is to do with the way in which the Pythagoreans represented numbers. Here it will help to visualize the way in which numbers were constructed: their idea of numbers is very much geo-

³⁵ On compound words see, for example, συνθέτους λόγους (“combination words”: T4 Leurini = 36A3 DK = *Suda* s.v. Ion Chios); σεληνο[πε]τή, “moon-fallen”, in the lyric fragment discussed by West (1983a) 46 (95* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F66a = Philodem. *De piet.* p. 13 Gomperz; tr. Campbell 1992 = fr. eleg. 30A); δακτυλωτόν, “with finger-like handles” (of wine cups: see LSJ s.v.), from Ion’s *Agamemnon* (1 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F1 = Ath. 468c); and see previous note. On his Homeric interest, compare his use of certain Homeric words (again for wine cups): φιάλη (25 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F20 = Ath. 501f) and κότυλον (61* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F51 = Ath. 478b), for which he was criticized by Epigenes as having misunderstood its meaning—see Leurini (1983) and (1984). On other instances of Homeric language see Clarke and Stevens in this volume.

³⁶ 115* (I) Leurini = 36A6 DK [second text] = Philop. *De gen. et corr.*, p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli, tr. Williams (1999): “Having discussed those who suppose that some one of the four [elements] is the principle of bodies, he now sets out [the views of] those who suppose more than one principle, either some of the four [or all: e.g.] fire and earth were suggested by Parmenides, *these together with air by Ion of Chios, the tragedian*, and four by Empedocles”. The omission of water seems odd. Note that Philoponus reports a different set of principles later on (fire-earth-water: 115*(II) Leurini = 277, 14 Vitelli); it is impossible to say whether he nodded off, had different sources at his disposal, or whether it is simply an error.

metric, viewed in a spatial way as an arrangement of dots or pebbles. For example:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 3 & = & \bullet \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \\
 4 & = & \bullet \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \bullet \\
 9 & = & \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \\
 10 & = & \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \\
 & & \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet
 \end{array}$$

This shows how numbers were given a geometrical nature, thus making ‘shape’ a factor in how regularity could be associated with even numbers, and irregularity with odd numbers (with nine it only works in two rows, not three).³⁷ It also makes explicit how the number three returns as a triangular shape associated with all numbers (*tetractys*: $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10$; and musical ratios: 1:2, 3:2, 3:4)—the triangle being the first geometrical figure. Thus, three acquires special meaning by signifying (almost magically) something which is finite and yet all-encompassing. In short, it represents confinement and comprehensiveness.

The Title

Let me offer a discussion of an issue related to the second problem broached at the start of this paper, namely *What does the title of the work mean?* Despite the considerable number of articles on Ion, little analysis has gone into this work’s form and meaning (exceptions are von Blumenthal 1939: 18 and Janko 2001: 7).³⁸ Given that a title *could* provide a valuable hint about the intended aims and content of a work, this would seem an omission. But we should tread with considerable caution. Giving a title to a philosophical prose work was not common until the Hellenistic period. As a rule, titles originated in first words (*incipit*) or thematic tags, and these were typically used *as a title* for a scholarly environment in which labelling and organizing writings are

³⁷ Compare Simpl. in *Phys.* 457.16–17: “it is the habit of Pythagoreans to illustrate by [drawing] figures (σχηματογραφεῖν)”.

³⁸ I have some doubt concerning Janko’s suggestion (2001) that it is connected to τριᾶζειν, “throw down thrice, win”, used in wrestling, but it is possible that this meaning somehow comes into play. See further below.

important, such as Aristotle's Lyceum or the Alexandrian library. And this is not all: I note that the verb used to indicate "title of a book" (ἐπιγράφειν) is sparse before the Hellenistic period.³⁹ Moreover, a study of the title commonly used for works of early natural philosophers, *On Nature* (περὶ φύσεως), has shown that, as a rule, this is absent from the original works and those of much later origin.⁴⁰ This particular title was subjected to a curious process of historical distortion whereby the attribution of titles seems to become more confident and certain as time progresses (that is, as the sources become more distant from works at issue). Therefore, it is not inappropriate to be somewhat sceptical about the question of whether it was Ion's own.⁴¹

The evidence for a title is (how could it not be?) threefold: we find τριαγμός, Κοσμολογικός and περὶ μετέωρων (latter two both in T8 Leurini = 36A2 DK = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835). The first one is the most quoted form and is found in three variations:

- (1) τριαγμός in the singular. This is found in Harpocration (post-Hellenistic).⁴²
- (2) τριαγμοί in the plural, as in Demetrius of Scepsis and Apollonides [both quoted by Harpocration]; Clement of Alexandria (c. AD 200), Diogenes Laertius (c. AD 200), and the *Suda* (c. AD 950).⁴³ How such a variation from singular to plural might occur is not obvious. (I am reminded of κόσμος/κοσμοί, a term related to cosmological context, which could be meaningfully employed in singular or plural—in fact, much depends on it in the case of Democritus, who is

³⁹ A search of TLG CD-ROM (E) for the noun and the middle verb form third person singular indicates that the stem occurs once in a small number of fifth century authors, including Thucydides and Plato, and then starts to proliferate after Aristotle (twelve instances), until it abounds in authors of the second century AD. Even here some distortion of the evidence may have occurred, since often the word is due to the (later) source author who mentions the (supposed) title of a work.

⁴⁰ Schmalzriedt (1970).

⁴¹ Note similar doubt in Dover's crisp parenthetical remark (1986: 28): "a philosophical work which was called (not necessarily by him, and even after him not always by everyone) Τριαγμός or Τριαγμοί".

⁴² Burkert (1972) 129 and n50 claims that Isocrates' testimony is a guarantee for the authenticity, but for that Schol. Ar. *Pax* would suffice (T8 Leurini = 36A2 DK [second text] = *FGrH* 392 T2).

⁴³ Diels does not report that the plural of the title also occurs in the *Suda* s.v. Orpheus (T9b Leurini = 36B2 DK = *FGrH* 392 F25c = o 654), with the gloss that the work is said to be by "Ion the tragedian"—a misunderstanding, according to von Blumenthal (1939) 20.

- supposed to have talked about multiple worlds, a claim denied by others. Pl. *Tim.* 55cd is usually taken as a reference to this view).
- (3) *τριασμοί*, according to Diehl (1916: 1864.2–3) an error: “*τριασμὸς* *irrtümlich*” (but see my comments below).

In terms of word-formation, *τριαγμός* seems unique: I note that few cognates exist; and the noun suffix *-μός* seems to have no specific meaning except to create a noun (Buck 1933: 319–20). There are plenty of parallel formations for either *-γμος* or *-σμος*, but so far I have found only one which resembles ours in both ending (*-μος*) and in variation of the root ending: the word *τριγμός*/*τρισμός*—meaning “screech of a partridge”—occurs in Aristotle (*Hist. an.* 614a22) and Theophrastus (*Caus. pl.* 5.10.5), or as “the grinding of teeth” in Hippocrates (*Acut.* 6).⁴⁴ Riedweg (2002: 82) has unearthed a semantic parallel of some kind: a work by Andron of Ephesus (date unknown) is called *Τριπὸς*, “*Tripod*” (see Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3.6 = Porph. fr. 408 Smith; cf. D. L. 1.30; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.129).

With these basic elements in mind, we can probe a little further into the morphology. There are, I believe, two distinct problems: for its meaning and translation, we need to decide how to parse *τριαγμός*; in addition, we should ask whether it is feasible that this word could fulfill the role of a title. As to the question of *parsing* the title, we have at least two options: (a) it could be a creative variation on *τριάς*, *τριάδος*, the term for the number three associated with Pythagoreanism (e.g. Arist. *Cael.* 268a13; *Metaph.* 1081a34 and b12); or (b) we might think of it as constructed from the stem *τριαγ*/*τριασ* + *μος*.

Now, instead of linking it to *ἄγνυμι*, “breaking” (von Blumenthal, Huxley), we may consider another possibility: the verb *τριάζω*/*τριάσσω* can mean “throw down three times” in wrestling or “multiply by three”. The latter meaning is found only late, once in Iamblichus, the fourth century Neoplatonist with neo-Pythagorean leanings whom we encountered before in the discussion of Ion’s father, Xuthus. Despite this link with Pythagoreanism, such a late occurrence can hardly be decisive for a noun from the fifth (?) century BC. The former meaning, emphasizing the verbal force in the noun, can perhaps be connected

⁴⁴ The formation which creates the variation of *-ζ-* and *-γ-* in stem-ending is related to the Indo-European suffix *-yo-* found in, for example, *ἄγιος* and *ἄζωμα*: Buck (1933) 317–8. Cf. Frisk (1960–72) 930, where the title is given, translated as “*Triade(n)*”, and said to be a denominative formation from *τρεῖς*, *τρία* (from which *τριάς*, *-δος* derives: p. 922, sub 4).

to τριακτήρ in Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 171–2, “winner” (said of Zeus in his power struggle with Cronus).⁴⁵ As was suggested by Janko (2001: 7), this could well be an allusion or pun on Protagoras’ Καταβάλλοντες (sc. λόγοι), “winning arguments”. It still remains difficult to see how winning can be meaningfully connected to the context of cosmology, to which the *Triagmos* seems to belong; here, “division” may fit the idea of structure slightly better (see above, on ethical concepts), but “multiplying” could also stand for the nature of the universe as characterized by endless triadic sets. But Ion was, of course, original enough to come up with new words (see notes 34–5), so a pun is a distinct possibility. As puns do not transfer well into another language, we are hard-pressed to match his ingenuity in coming up with one English word, if indeed Ion packed into this title a genre marker (“Triad” as Pythagorean cosmology), a second-order comment on the effectiveness of the work (allusion to winning), and a pointer for the thematic coherence of his treatment in Pythagorean style (importance of the number three). Whether or not the title is a tongue-in-cheek stab at “winning the cosmological contest”, it is without doubt unique and original. I doubt whether its full meaning can be determined with absolute certainty.

All *translations* obviously attempt to find a term that can convey “three-ness”—and at the same time a notion which can represent multitude as well as a unit (in other words, a collective abstract noun). Unfortunately, few proposals really succeed: TREBLINGS (Kirk, Raven and Schofield 1983, no. 262) is rather uninformative; TRIPLE DIVISION or TRIPLES (Huxley 1963: 39 following von Blumenthal’s *DREI-TEILUNG*) hangs on a tentative connection with ἄγνυμι, “to break”; Diels’ *DREIKAMPF* (DK 36, p. 379) is not explained and not particularly plausible (does he mean that τρι-αγ-μος derives from τρι-αγων?); Dover’s THREE or THREENESS, though simple, does nothing to advance our understanding of the content of the work. Perhaps Barnes’ TRIAD, the most recent and modern rendering, fulfils *both* criteria of *multitude* and *unit*.

At this point, we should return briefly to the question of whether this title could have been Ion’s. First some facts: as far as we can tell, Ion only uses the numeral three and the abstract noun τρίας. This shift from “three” to “triad” is an interesting move to a more abstract level. When the title first occurs in Harpocration (post-Hellenistic),

⁴⁵ I am grateful to an anonymous reader for this parallel.

uncertainty about its form (singular or plural) was already apparent. Early titles usually grow out of the prepositional phrase “περὶ X” as a content-indicator, so a singular noun is also the more unusual choice (Andron’s *Tripod* is probably fourth century BC). As noted, the content might not have been known to Harpocration, given his qualifier: the indefinite pronoun *τι*. Again, titles are a bookish affair, and often serve a practical function in the referencing or storing of books, and the need for such a function may not have arisen before Aristotle. Therefore, even Clement’s seemingly confident attribution of a passage to the *Triagmos* (116(I) Leurini = 36B2 DK [second text] = Clem. Al. *Str.* 1.131) may not be as secure as would appear. On the other hand, this title *is* unique, as is the *Kōsmologikos*, so we do have a possible argument in favour of its authenticity. For the second title we may have a small but tenuous point in favour, because the scholiast (mostly ninth-tenth centuries AD, but some go back to Didymus) uses the verb *φέρεται*, which in such contexts means “is preserved, has been transmitted”. Can we argue either way with absolute certainty for a *hapax legomenon*? Until we have a text from the work in which either is used, I suspect we cannot. Nevertheless, all things considered, in particular Ion’s original use of language (on which see, for example, Clarke in this volume), he was no doubt capable of creating such a word, if only to claim a niche within the Pythagorean philosophical tradition.

Concluding Remarks

In any discussion about Ion of Chios, the challenge of speculation will always be exacerbated by the persistent gaps and uncertainties of the evidence. However, not all speculation is fruitless. I have presented a new account of the extant fragments that constitute the ‘philosophical thought’ of Ion of Chios. I have included all the fragments (suggesting the B fragments might be augmented by one, viz, 36A7 DK = *TEXT* 4),⁴⁶ and provided more context to Ion’s thought, without imposing too rigorous a coherence upon these scattered bits and pieces—a temptation which always presents itself when dealing with fragments. Ion is one of those figures who lost out in the struggle for literary survival. In ancient times Ion’s literary output, though at some stage part of the

⁴⁶ *TEXT* 4 = 117* Leurini = 36A7 DK = *Dox. Gr.* 356b21 = Aët. *Plac.* 2.25.11.

canon, was relegated early on to the “second eleven”,⁴⁷ the justification for which is now lost.⁴⁸ It is no surprise, therefore, that this fate has been perpetuated even in modern perspective, given that even his standing as a lyric poet has been eclipsed by others.⁴⁹

Except for some hints and brief references of near-contemporaries (Plato, Aristophanes, Isocrates), most of our sources are much later, and these all seem to come from a learned environment, its pivotal centre being Alexandria:⁵⁰ the important sources such as Clement, Diogenes Laertius, Harpocration (possibly based on Callimachus),⁵¹ the *Suda* (often based on D. L.), Philoponus and the Scholia on Aristophanes all point in this direction. Plutarch might seem an exception, but he was a voracious reader and punctilious maker of notes, basing his writing on a wide range of sources.⁵² One senses that Ion’s somewhat idiosyncratic and eclectic writings were only appreciated by learned readers, and that soon after his death the survival of his work depended on the specialist interests of scholars such as grammarians, historians, anthologists and philosophers. He did have one author write a book about him, the otherwise unknown Baton of Sinope mentioned by Athenaeus,⁵³ and one Epigenes is said to have interpreted his expressions (see note

⁴⁷ Diehl (1916) suspects that soon after the third century BC his original works had disappeared. Contrast West (1985) 71, who thinks that they were still available up to the third century AD.

⁴⁸ Surely Pseudo-Longinus’ comment is a later verdict: T17 Leurini = 36A4 DK = *TrGF* 19 T6 = *Subl.* 33.5.

⁴⁹ It may just be the result of practical considerations, but his marginal status today is summed up by Campbell’s Loeb volume of *Greek Lyric*, vol. 4, which bears the title “Bacchylides, Corinna, and Others” [my emphasis] among whom Ion is listed as “also included”. However, as noted above, Barnes (1987) gave him a separate (one page) section.

⁵⁰ I note Diehl’s comment (1916: col. 1865, ll. 29–33): “vor allem Ions Tragödien im Altertum Gegenstand philologischer Studien von seiten der Lexikographen und Fundgruben für Verfasser von Anthologien and [sic] Exzerptenliteratur”.

⁵¹ As suggested by Huxley (1965) 39n48, presumably based on T9a, 114 Leurini = 36A1 DK = Harpocr. s.v. Ion, where Callimachus is mentioned. The problem of *polyeideia* and categorization was already raised in antiquity, as T15b Leurini = *Diegesis* to Callim. *Iamb* 13 suggests: see Pfeiffer (1949) 205–7 (fr. 203); cf. TT22a, 24 [= T9a] Leurini = fr. 449 Pfeiffer (p. 348) on the attribution of the *Triagmos* in Callimachus’ *Pinakes*. See also Henderson in this volume.

⁵² He even knew Latin (pp. 19–21): see Lamberton (2001) 13 (with further references).

⁵³ Βάτων δ’ ὁ Σινωπεὺς [see *FGrH* 268] ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἰωνος τοῦ ποιητοῦ..., “Baton of Sinope in his work *On Ion the Poet*...” (tr. Campbell 1992; 94 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T8 = 31 West = Ath. 436f; Ael. *VH* 2.41). Jacoby (Commentary on *FGrH* 268, p. 211) thinks that the book might have included interpretations of poems, but admits that it is unclear why Baton would have been interested in Ion.

35). It is a reminder of how little is needed to become marginal or a curiosity, irretrievably lost for posterity.

Ion will remain an intriguing and elusive figure. It is unclear what purpose this philosophical prose work may have served, and its fragmentary state will not allow a full answer. Dover speculates that it might be a creative and playful “exploration of the implications of an idea” in the manner of poets, and he compares Pindar’s *Second Olympian* with its unusual allusion to afterlife and a cycle of incarnation, which also links him to Empedocles.⁵⁴ This seems quite plausible. What is clear is that by the time of Harpocration (*TEXT 1*) the content of the *Triagmos* was something of a mystery for the grammarian (or his source): to me, the indefinite pronoun in *τι σύγγραμμα φιλόσοφόν* signals no direct knowledge of the work itself. Ion was a resourceful author, willing to try his hand at anything; maybe he was joining in with the fashion of the day, which was to consider and present an explanation of the physical world in prose. This is testimony to his versatility, as Callimachus confirms, but also, inadvertently, it may have meant that he was spreading himself too thinly. As a result, a remarkable reputation in any specific area was never his. My guess is that Isaiah Berlin would probably have categorized Ion as a fox—a type of author who knows many things—as opposed to the hedgehog, which “knows one big thing”.⁵⁵ If he had, it would be quite appropriate, since in one fragment Ion expresses a dislike of hedgehogs (surely a stab at Archilochus?), preferring the bravery of lions: the hedgehog, when the enemy appears “winds its spiny body in a ball, and is invincible against bite and touch” (44 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F38 = Ath. 91d; tr. Gulick).

Perhaps we may comfort ourselves with the thought that more of the work might not necessarily have given us more of his ‘philosophy’. Like the Presocratics with whom he wished to be affiliated, he may have been giving an outline, which represented “little more than a provocative preview”⁵⁶ in written form. This might have been built upon further

⁵⁴ Dover (1986) 31 after Sandbach (1958–59). Pindar’s *Ode* was in honour of Theron, tyrant of Acragas, native city of Empedocles. Dover (pp. 31–2) points out in passing that the word *kruphos* (concealment) only occurs at Pind. *Ol.* 2.97, where he clearly uses Pythagorean ideas of reincarnation, and in Empedocles 31B27.3 DK (see also notes 24 and 25, above).

⁵⁵ See Berlin (1953), where he explains how he came to use these labels for characterizing the great minds in history: they originate in Archilochus fr. 201 West (c. 650 BC).

⁵⁶ Tarrant (1996) 135 on the writings of the Presocratics.

during oral exchange between teacher and pupil in the more formalized philosophical seminar. I somehow doubt, however, whether it was the objective of this polymath to acquire pupils and teach Pythagoreanism. His virtuosity in many areas of literary expression evokes the image of a brilliant raconteur and writer who contributed to, and possibly ‘pioneered’ other ‘genres’. His contribution to philosophy is hardest to assess, since it has barely survived: we see a versatile mind capable of handling abstract notions at the juncture between philosophy and literature.⁵⁷ However, for a better grasp of content and argumentative structure, we would need more than a grand opening statement and some ‘mental sound bites’.

I therefore agree with Dover (1986: 30) that Ion wore his Pythagoreanism rather lightly, trying his hand at yet another mode of expression.⁵⁸ His interest in Homer, tragedy and lyric poetry indicates his position as a ‘public intellectual’ providing comments on social and moral issues (like Xenophanes), which could mean that the cosmology he outlines was a more perfunctory part of the overall account. We should not forget that the split between philosophy and literature had not yet reached its full measure. But, as we saw, Isocrates *does* give him a place among “experts”, which must indicate some kind of recognition for his (perhaps) one and only attempt to philosophize. If he did anticipate Plato’s dialogue format, as Dover plausibly suggests (1986: 34–5), it should be added that it was no doubt Plato who outshone Ion to such an extent that he was not remembered for this contribution. The dialogues by other authors prior to, and contemporary with, Plato have almost vanished. Ion may thus be regarded as a kind of catalyst, whose often original forays into the different fields of the literary landscape caused him to be scattered like light through a prism. All that remains for us to see is the glimmer of a long extinguished star.

⁵⁷ See comments by West (1985) 76 on this point.

⁵⁸ Cf. Diehl (1916) 1864, 46–7, who thinks the *Triagmos* was written “*in Anlehnung an die Pythagoreer*” [my emphasis].

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

LEGWORK: ION'S SOCRATES

RICHARD FLETCHER

Since I suppose I cannot know in advance which features of my life will be telling ones here, in recounting my work, I have to tell the whole of it, up to a point. This might be done in a sentence, as in a dictionary entry, or in an entry for every day of this life, something Thoreau and Emerson nearly managed for theirs. But here, experimentally, to tell in a couple of minutes my story as approaching philosophy...¹

Introduction

Ἴων δὲ ὁ Χίος καὶ νέον ὄντα εἰς Σάμον σὺν Ἀρχελάῳ ἀποδημῆσαι·

(111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23)²

Diogenes Laertius' reference to Socrates' journey to Samos with Archelaus as a young man contradicts one of the most celebrated facts in the life of philosophy: "Socrates never travelled".³ This

¹ Cavell (1994) 11. Cavell's approach to the question of autobiography and philosophy in a lecture on an excursion to Jerusalem—ranging from the dictionary entry to the entry for every day—is central to my approach to philosophical biography and autobiography offered in *Ion's works*—as read through Diogenes Laertius—in an attempt to elucidate Socrates' *apodemia* in the *Epidemiai*. Furthermore, his anecdote about Lanzmann's *Shoah* (pp. 12–3) bears witness to some ideas of locality, testimony and memory that this paper will approach.

² I take issue with the classification of Diogenes' citation as a fragment, as we shall see.

³ "Except on military expeditions". This is one of the most celebrated facts, along with "Socrates never wrote". Derrida's novel approach to the possibility of a writing Socrates (Derrida 1987) is littered with certain "real-life events and people: landing at Heathrow, lecturing at Oxford, landing at Kennedy, teaching at Yale..." (Rorty 1989: 127) that seem to figure the narrator as a "travelling salesman" befitting his constant production of post-cards. Remember it is on the road (see *Epistle* 7. 330bc) that Plato himself gets as near to *his* Socrates as he can—*Epistle* 2. 314c: "There is no writing of Plato's, nor will there ever be; those that are now called so come from an idealized and youthful [νέου] Socrates". This is one of Derrida's favourite passages of the *Epistles*,

detail of the official biography, based as it is on the portrait painted in the texts of Plato, means that Diogenes' footnote refers to a tradition that is necessarily at odds with, and possibly one collated to vie with, the dominant Platonic model.⁴ In addition to the importance of this tradition for *Socratica*, the source named by Diogenes—our polymath, Ion of Chios—adds a particular irony to the anti-Platonic version of Socrates' *bios*. Ion's *Epidemiai* (*Visits*), the text generally acknowledged as behind Diogenes' citation, has been described as "the seed from which the Platonic dialogue grew".⁵ Thus, the anecdote presents an anti-Platonic tradition in an Ur-Plato form. But why should such an irony matter? Surely the fact of Socrates' journey can be separated from the form in which it is presented, and generic genealogy can be distinguished from biographical detail? The ostensible aim of this paper is to suggest the contrary—Socrates' *apodemia* and Ion's *Epidemiai* must be taken together.

Ion's *Epidemiai* recorded the personal contact between Ion and several important figures of fifth century Athenian culture.⁶ We are uncertain as to the form of Ion's *Visits*: in some cases it is Ion who is visiting, in some cases he is visited, either on Chios, or in Athens, or elsewhere (see Pelling in this volume on this term). This multifarious theme of travel, within the generic scope of Ion's project, controls Ion's subjects within the possibilities of the *Epidemiai*. To be blunt, it is of vital importance whether you think that Ion met Socrates once, many times or not at all; who visited whom; and whether it occurred on Samos, Chios or in Athens. For the presumed circumstances of this meeting directly determine Ion's place within the traditions of philosophical literature, and the relationship between the *Epidemiai* and that tradition. In this context, to argue that Ion's Socrates journeyed to Samos with Archelaus for *philosophical* purposes, the *topos* of the philosophical journey bleeds

which he found to be "greater than the works": Derrida (1987) 85. Cf. his use of the same passage in Derrida (1981) 170.

⁴ Woodbury (1971) 300 ("collected to correct"); *Crito* 52b–53a; *Phdr.* 230c–e. Jacoby (1947a) 10: "In fact, there is a glaring contradiction... between Plato and Ion; and we are duty bound to decide between them instead of trying to get rid of Ion..."

⁵ Dover (1986) 37. Such a description has not been adopted by readings of the origins of the Platonic dialogues; nothing in Kahn (1996), for example. Dover's *Symposium* (1980) seems not to have started him thinking about Ion, nor does Ion seem to have changed anything about the *Symposium*.

⁶ On Ion's Athenian *close-ups* see Gentili and Cerri (1988) 69–72. On Ion's contribution to the memoir genre in general, see Wehrli (1973), Strasburger (1986) and Piccirilli (1998).

back into Ion's project of biographical memorialization and anecdote, and also presumes some relationship between Ion and the forms of philosophical enquiry in fifth century Ionia and their development in late fifth and early fourth century Athens.

This is Ion's story as it borders on philosophy. However, accessing the personal voice of the *Epidemiai* for Ion's visit to the journeying Socrates means negotiating the mediating text of Diogenes' *Lives and Opinions*. For two vital reasons, Ion's Socrates 'fragment' cannot be easily prised from the contexts of Diogenes' text. First, it represents a generic model of citation within Diogenes' text that has an intrinsic affinity with the genre of memoir literature assigned to the *Epidemiai*—the literal meaning of testimony.⁷ Therefore, the move from "Ion of Chios says that Socrates travelled..." to the projected "I met Socrates on the road" inheres a development that speaks volumes about genres of reference and citation.⁸ Secondly, it repeats a motif of philosophical succession and development signposted elsewhere in Diogenes' text—in the introduction, the *Life* of Archelaus and earlier in the *Life* of Socrates. In making their way from the extant citation to the assumed original context, from the tenuous entry in the text of Diogenes to the general idea of the memoir 'genre' of the *Epidemiai*, all readings of 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23 call for creative conjecture and speculative padding in order to access the whole story, through re-inserting the 'I' of Ion (back?) into the narrative.⁹ In refusing simply to read *through*

⁷ This is a conflation of life and work if ever there was one. To say "Plato says" means to say "I have heard Plato" and the same questions ensue: how many times?—just a one off?—never?—where? I shall argue that the formal features of the "generic headings" of the *Epidemiai* resemble the generic form of the citation.

⁸ Or, "Socrates said to me, 'As a young man, I travelled to Samos with Archelaus'". According to Jacoby (1947a) 11, either Ion met Socrates when he was a young man and remembered this meeting when he was writing his *Memoirs* later; or, he met Socrates later who himself recounted the details of his trip with Archelaus to Ion, who recorded the anecdote in his *Memoirs*. Huxley (1965) 38 (meeting in Athens), West (1985) 71, 73 (meeting in Samos) and Dover (1986) 33 (implies a meeting in Samos) opt for the former, which is supported by the form of the Sophocles anecdote (104 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F6 = Ath. 603e–604d)—on which see Dover (1986) 33. Jacoby claims that it does not matter which explanation is correct as to the fact that Socrates was a follower of Archelaus in his youth. This defeatism presumes that the fact can be taken from its context/s—Diogenes' citation and Ion's *Epidemiai*. While I am not aiming to disprove that 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23 is from the *Epidemiai*, I am wary of how the attraction of the idea surely has outweighed the evidence.

⁹ Jacoby (1947a) 9–11 begins by castigating the fantasies of previous scholars concerning the Samian expedition and continues by adding his two "possibilities" for the encounter. Huxley (1965) 37–8 speculates that they were on their way to see Melissus.

Diogenes, my argument will constantly deal with those questions of philosophical legacy that Ion's Socrates challenges.

Diogenes' Sources: The Genre of Philosophy's Life

Accessing Ion's Socratic anecdote requires an attempt to read through its extant 'secondary' manifestation in Diogenes' text to its lost 'primary' context. This process is ultimately problematic given that Diogenes' references are necessarily taken out of their original context.¹⁰ However, this situation does not mean that Diogenes' text can be by-passed, in spite of the general acceptance that Diogenes *the man* does not impinge upon the material he has collated.¹¹ Issues of authorship aside, negotiating Diogenes' use of Ion as a source is not only necessary to any reconstruction of Ion's texts in themselves, but also for understanding our preconceptions about those texts. As we shall see, Ion's role as a source for Diogenes is dictated by features of (conceptions of) his own texts.¹²

One way of accessing Ion's originality is to appreciate a marked split in Diogenes' scholarship between sources that somehow pre-empt the genre of his work—so-called "succession-literature"¹³—and other sources culled for information by Diogenes and, often, by these predecessors.¹⁴ While the (potential) citation of the *Epidemiai* is not as a

West (1985) 73 follows Huxley. Cf. Dover (1986) 32–4 on the generic potential (although nothing on the fragment).

¹⁰ Nor do they often fit their present context according to Mejer (1978) 19: "Needless to say, Diogenes' book is filled with *quotations and references which neither seem to fit the context nor to reflect the context in the original source*".

¹¹ Long (1986) 433–6 on Diogenes' unobtrusive personality.

¹² Long (1986) 433–4 inadvertently returns to Diogenes-the-author: "Arcesilaus was an unusual philosopher. He did not have a set of doctrines which Antigonos or Diogenes has forborne to relate; nor, I think, did Menedemus. Hence anecdotes about what these philosophers said may have a significance greater than their biographer himself realized. Inadvertently, the biographer's anecdotal style may in these cases be something more than a beguiling way of adorning a tale". As we have seen, the general preconceptions about the *Epidemiai* are two-fold. First, that behind Diogenes' testimony is a version of the "generic heading" of the *Epidemiai*—"I met Socrates"—that has a relationship with the model of citation. Secondly, that the *Epidemiai* are predecessors of Platonic versions of Socratic dialogue.

¹³ On which see Mejer (1978) and Warren (forthcoming).

¹⁴ This symbolic split can be neatly seen *via* an analogous *exemplum*. Diogenes gives versions of roughly the same anecdote about Pythagoras and the original use of the term "philosopher" (1.12 and 8.8). In the latter account, he refers to Sosicrates' *Suc-*

predecessor in the genre of succession-literature, the closeness of the genre of Ion's text to the biographical and anecdotal methods of the succession genre complicates this issue.¹⁵

The Socrates anecdote is the only reference to Ion that does not contain some other marker of the work from which it is taken, apart from its form.¹⁶ If Ion wrote that Socrates went to Samos with Arche-laous as a young man, the argument that he must have done so in his *Memoirs* is undermined by Ion's Socratic footnote's marginalization in studies of the *Epidemiai* before and ever since Jacoby's "Remarks".¹⁷ Dover does an amazing job of recreating the "generic heading" of the *Epidemiai* through developing (or imagining) "an analogy for this type of composition" in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*—without even mentioning 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23 and Ion's Socrates.¹⁸ To some extent, this omission by Dover could be a respectful nod towards the *validity* of Ion's meeting with Socrates as opposed to the *fictionalized* shop-visits within Xenophon's text.¹⁹ The movement from the realities of the memoir genre and the fictionalizing frame of the Socratic dialogue had a major part to play in generic genealogy. Bakhtin argued that:

As the historical and memoir basis of the genre is weakened, the ideas of others become more and more plastic; people and ideas which in

cessions as his source, while in the former, to a dialogue by Heraclides of Pontus. It is generally agreed that Sosicrates is using Heraclides. The primacy of Heraclides is an important issue, not simply for chronological reasons, but in his very nature as a 'source' and its usage in Diogenes' text. The originality of Heraclides' dialogue is gestured at in Hicks' (creative) translation, in which he says that Heraclides "makes him [Pythagoras] say", rather than the straightforward Sosicrates' "says".

¹⁵ Again my analogous *exemplum* could be of some use, since Heraclides' dialogue seems to have negotiated ideas of philosophical succession (Pythagoras to Empedocles), although the actual process of this succession is unclear in the fragments.

¹⁶ 92 Leurini = 36B4 DK = 30 West = D. L. 1.120 (an epigram about Pherecydes and Pythagoras); 116(II) Leurini = 36B2 DK = D. L. 8.8 (from the *Triagmos*).

¹⁷ Duncan (1939) does not even refer to the Socrates anecdote, and many are sceptical, for example, Piccirilli (1998) 149 ("forse"). See Henderson, in this volume on *OCD* 1949—"possibly"; on *OCD*² 1970—"deftly smuggled into the prose"; but *not* in *OCD*³ 1996—"not necessarily known to him in person".

¹⁸ Dover (1986) 33.

¹⁹ Xenophon is, in general, an interesting foil for Ion, huddled together under Plato's shadow as "incompatibles", especially in the accusation that his absence from Athens during Socrates' crucial years meant that he did not have first-hand access to the philosopher. Also, is it so easy to call Ion an H. G. Wells as opposed to G. E. Moore in response to Socrates' Bertrand Russell, given the *Triagmos*? See Vlastos (1991) 298. On the rehabilitation of Xenophon's Socrates see Morrison (1987); Gray (1995) and (1998).

historical reality never entered into real dialogic contact (but could have done so) begin to come together in dialogues.²⁰

Within this version of the development of the Socratic dialogue as a by-way to the dialogic novel, Bakhtin's reference to the memoir basis of the genre specifically features Ion's *Epidemiai*.²¹ In spite of Bakhtin's claims, the idea of Ion's *Epidemiai* as a predecessor to the Socratic dialogues of Plato is not current in (specifically) Platonic scholarship.²² This omission may perhaps be accounted for by juxtaposing the translation from Diogenes' citation to the assumed first person narrative of Ion with the genealogy of the Socratic dialogue *via* Xenophon. Implied in the citation of Diogenes is a secondary level of transmission—so too with the Platonic and Xenophontic example of Socratic dialogue. We never read, "I met Socrates and he said..."²³ In short, accessing the Socratic dialogue through the *Epidemiai* and accessing the personal voice of Ion in his meeting with Socrates through the testimonia of Diogenes' *Lives* become similar quests for approaching the philosophical life. Ion's *Visits*, in approaching the figure of Socrates, even as a young man alongside his teacher, mirror the *topos* of the philosophical journey that they are set to describe.

²⁰ Bakhtin (1984) 111–2.

²¹ On the serio-comic strand running through classical literature, Bakhtin includes the *Epidemiai* as a forerunner to Socratic dialogue. Bakhtin (1981) 21: "In Classical times this elemental popular laughter gave rise directly to a broad and varied field of ancient literature, one that the ancients themselves expressively labelled 'spoudogeloion', that is, the field of 'serio-comical'. The weakly plotted mimes of Sophron, all the bucolic poems, the fable, early memoir literature (the 'Epidemiai' of Ion of Chios, the 'Homiliae' of Critias), pamphlets all belong to this field; here the ancients themselves included the 'Socratic dialogues' (as a genre), here belong Roman satire (Lucilius, Horace, Persius, Juvenal), the extensive literature of the 'Symposia' and finally Menippean satire (as a genre) and dialogues of the Lucianic type. All these genres, permeated with the 'serio-comical', are authentic predecessors of the novel". On Ion's obscurity within Bakhtin's genealogy, see Holquist in Bakhtin (1981) xvi: "When he does cite a familiar period, he often tends to isolate an otherwise obscure figure within it—thus his focusing on Pigres of Halicarnassus or Ion of Chios among the Greeks, on Varro among the Romans..."

²² See note 5 above.

²³ It could be argued that if the Socrates meeting resembled the meeting of Sophocles, then Ion's role was merely in presenting the frame of an encounter between the famous figure and someone other than himself. However, in the Socrates anecdote we have no idea who was speaking to whom. Was it an anecdote about their teacher/pupil relationship or was that just an idle context?

The Hellenistic Socrates Before Plato?

As we have seen, the two-fold approach to the genre of the anecdote, in its extant and projected forms, and its implications for the genre of the *Epidemiai*, makes some contributions to philosophical genre within the 'genealogy' of the Platonic dialogue. However, the actual content of the fragment—that Socrates travelled—must be read against the Platonic figure of Socrates. The Ion reference brought in as a footnote in Diogenes' text affirms this. In spite of Ion's anecdote holding the primary position as the earliest biographical evidence for Socrates, he will always assume the position *after* Plato, as a footnote to the official biography—"p then S".²⁴

A further hinge between the anti-Platonic figure of the travelling Socrates and the pre-Platonic form of the *Epidemiai* could be the role of Archelaus in the anecdote. Could there be a link between the Platonic denial of Socrates' *apodemia* and Platonic reticence as to his role as the pupil of Archelaus?²⁵ Asking why Plato would underplay the role of Archelaus in Socrates' development could be turned into asking why his role was exaggerated in post-Platonic accounts.²⁶ Diogenes' account helps here, specifically as a store-house for Hellenistic doxography. The links between Socrates and Archelaus referred to in 111* Leurini = *FGH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23 are pre-empted, not only in the *Life* of Archelaus and earlier in the *Life* of Socrates, but also in the general introduction in the discussion of the two-fold geographical origins of philosophy (1.14):

Θαλοῦ μὲν γὰρ Ἀναξίμανδρος, οὗ Ἀναξίμενης, οὗ Ἀναξαγόρας, οὗ Ἀρχέλαος, οὗ Σωκράτης ὁ τὴν ἠθικὴν εἰσαγωγών.

The succession [of the Ionian school] passes from Thales through Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, to Socrates, who introduced ethics or moral philosophy.

²⁴ Huxley (1965) 36. Derrida (1987) *passim*.

²⁵ Plato's reticence has been adopted by modern scholars. On Diogenes' *Life* of Archelaus, Giannantoni (1992) has only three lines (3608).

²⁶ On Archelaus in Plato, see Panchenko (1999) 22—"nothing in the Platonic dialogues". Although note Burnet (1911) on *Phd.* 96a–99c in which notions of philosophical succession and division are linked with travel—τὸν δεῦτερον πλοῦν, "[my] second voyage" (99c9; tr. Fowler); on which see Vander Waerdt (1994b) 66–7.

And the divisions of the parts of philosophy (1.18):

καὶ μέχρι μὲν Ἀρχελάου τὸ φυσικὸν ἦν εἶδος· ἀπὸ δὲ Σωκράτους, ὡς προεῖρηται, τὸ ἠθικόν·

Physics flourished down to the time of Archelaus; ethics, as we have said, started with Socrates.²⁷

Focus on the divisions of philosophy has been considered to be a Hellenistic phenomenon.²⁸ Therefore, the image of Socrates as the inventor of ethics at the expense of Archelaus' physics has been seen as "the most commonly repeated Socratic characteristic in the doxographical tradition" of post-Platonic and Hellenistic philosophy.²⁹ Traditions of post-Platonic and Hellenistic doxography that amplify the connections between Socrates and Archelaus as a transition from physics to ethics are always considered as direct responses to the Platonic Socrates.³⁰ However, some have argued that rather than a biographical fact, the teacher-pupil relationship between Socrates and Archelaus was a "doxographical construction" of the fourth century.³¹ Nevertheless, this argument is dependent on there being a non-philosophical relationship between Socrates and Archelaus and/or the journey to Samos being non-philosophical.³² Furthermore, any attempt to extract doxographical and biographical fact from intellectual biography is instantly problematic. Woodbury's arguments resort to the primacy of the Platonic figure of Socrates—in which case Ion needs to be explained away. This is done by making the journey to Samos with Archelaus part

²⁷ We could compare how Diogenes refers to the Pythagoras anecdote twice—once in his general introduction to his work and once during the life of Pythagoras itself—with the first mention an important moment in the history of philosophy in general.

²⁸ See Algra *et al.* (1999) xiii–xvi.

²⁹ Long (1988) 152.

³⁰ Warren (forthcoming).

³¹ Woodbury (1971) 309. Some were unsure whether it was the philosopher Socrates at all—argued by Calder (1961) 85—after Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Kirchner. See Woodbury (1971) 302n12. Flores (1991) 43 calls Socrates Archelaus' student (*allievo*).

³² Woodbury (1971) argues against the paederastic relationship and for the Samian campaign, although his argument is confusing and based on the damning of a paederastic relationship *for Socrates*. On *apodemia* referring to philosophical journeys within Diogenes, consider the following examples: 4.29 refers to Arcesilaus' travel (*ἀπεδήμησεν*) to Sardis with his teacher Autolycus. The conflation of youth and the philosophical journey is apparent in Diogenes' *Life* of Pythagoras (8.2): "While still young (*νέος*), so eager was he for knowledge, he left (*ἀπεδήμησε*) his own country and had himself initiated into all the mysteries and rites not only of Greece but also of foreign countries". Democritus travelled to Egypt to learn geometry (9.35); Timon stayed with Stilpo in Megara (9.109).

of the Samian campaign, in spite of Jacoby's protests, and therefore a non-philosophical journey and relationship. Another argument for underplaying the biographical basis for doxographical developments could be the focus on the youth of Socrates. The paederastic argument could either undermine the philosophical importance of the journey and the teacher/pupil relationship, or affirm it. In any case, it should not simply be disregarded as fourth century slander, given the institution's centrality to fifth century Athenian culture.

Therefore, if the teacher/pupil relationship between Archelaus and Socrates can be assured, is it possible that Hellenistic accounts of philosophical division return to a pre-Platonic tradition of Socrates' intellectual development, epitomized in the relationship? Such a hypothesis is obviously impossible to prove. Nevertheless, the later development of the Academy could have looked back to a pre-Platonic conception of Socrates, which could have been memorialized by Ion.³³ In that case, the affinities between Ion's reference to the travels of Archelaus and Socrates with Hellenistic constructions of the Socratic figure as based on the transition from natural philosophy to ethics, may not only be a marked reversal of Platonism, but also a reversal based on return to a pre-Platonic portrait of Socrates as depicted in the *Epidemiai*. In such a context, Diogenes' reference to the youthful study of the post-Platonic head of the Academy could be a reference to Arcesilaus' polymathic tendencies, or, indeed, a response to Ion's pre-Platonic Socrates.

Where's Ion?

ΣΩ. τὸν Ἴωνα χαίρειν. πόθεν τὰ νῦν ἡμῖν ἐπιδεδήμηκας;

SOCRATES: Welcome, Ion. Where have you come from now, to pay us this visit?

(Pl. *Ion* 530a)

³³ It is tempting to read too much into T20 Leurini = D. L. 4.31: Arcesilaus' youthful study of Ion. Duncan (1939) 125 calls it a "character-study". Ostensibly referring to Ion's poetic works, the verb *χαρακτηρίζω* could refer to a more generalized "characterizing" on Ion's versatility as poet and philosopher. Therefore, in his return to Ion's Socrates, perhaps, we could chart Arcesilaus' later development of the Academy as a return to Socrates' *ad hominem* practices, thus overriding Plato's portrait. On T20 Leurini in general see Dorandi (1992) 3779 with nn139, 140. On Arcesilaus' return to Socrates see Schofield (1999) 325.

In his answer to Plato's Socrates, Ion explains that he has not come from his home in Ephesus but from Epidaurus, where he has just won the rhapsode competition at the festival of Asclepius.³⁴ In response to Ion's victory, Socrates states that "we should make sure that we win at the Panathenaia" (530b). Murray's comment on Socrates' use of the first person plural is revealing:

[T]here is irony in the way that S[ocrates] associates himself with Ion through his patronising use of the first person plural. But despite their apparent rapport, a basic contrast has already been established between Ion as a much travelled man of the world, and S[ocrates] as one who knows little of what goes on outside his own city.³⁵

This contrast, and Socrates' response to Ion's victory in Epidaurus, implies an Athenocentric view of the Greek states, imported in to aid her glory. How does this portrayal of the stationary Athenian Socrates relate to the itinerant figure of Ion of Chios? Does Plato's portrayal of Ion of Ephesus simply figure him as non-Athenian, or is there mileage in accounting for his specific location?³⁶ Furthermore, does the detail that Socrates and Archelaus went specifically to Samos have any bearing on ideas of Athenian hegemony in the fifth century Greek world?

In what follows, I want to consider the geographical implications of the trip to Samos and the possibilities for the divisions of philosophy offered by the image of Archelaus and Socrates, hitherto discussed, in making such a trip. Choosing to take Ion's account seriously requires an anti-Platonic view of the stationary Socrates. The implications of the travelling Socrates must be read in relation to the geographically sensitive idea of philosophical succession offered in Diogenes through the split between Ionian and Italian philosophy.

There have been several accounts of the reasons for the journey to Samos.³⁷ In general, the journey has been read as a "philosophical journey", potentially to visit Melissus.³⁸ Another tenuous suggestion is based on Samos as the birthplace of Pythagoras. For Diogenes, Pythagoras marks the beginning of the Italian philosophers in his narrative (8.1).

³⁴ I owe the other Ion's presence, at this point in my argument, to a suggestion made by John Henderson.

³⁵ Murray (1997) 100.

³⁶ Nails (2002) 176: "Plato's Ion was from Ephesus, however, a fact emphasized in the dialogue". Does *one* mention emphasize or trivialize Ion's origins?

³⁷ Many based on issues of chronology concerning the Samian campaign.

³⁸ See notes 8 and 9, above.

Therefore, in very schematic terms, Archelaus' and Socrates' trip to Samos could represent the beginnings of a deviation from the Ionian physicists, as implied by his move to ethics, as well as a pilgrimage to one of the greatest exponents of the philosophical journey itself. However, given this potential response—the specific location of Samos—the role of Ion is still uncertain within this philosophical journey. What is invested in Ion's portrayal of Socrates, in its conflation of biography and doxography, and in the philosophical life as represented by a pilgrimage or visit with his teacher? Must Ion's recitation of the fact that Socrates went to Samos with Archelaus as a young man represent some form of philosophical stance for Ion?

Throughout discussions of the *Epidemiai*, Ion is constantly figured as a commentator, an outsider to the people and events he records. For example, his non-Athenian identity has been read as an ideal tool through which he could gain access to Athenian cultural and political life.³⁹ Accessing Ion through Diogenes mirrors this role (as commentator) as a source for the philosophical life rather than as an exponent of one—a role that could be assimilated to that of Diogenes himself.⁴⁰ For Diogenes, the epigrams have been seen as the place to look for a personal philosophical affiliation.⁴¹ This approach could be paralleled in the way that the poem attributed to Ion on Pherecydes and Pythagoras within Diogenes' text offers an insight into Ion's own Pythagoreanism or anti-Pythagoreanism.⁴²

In this climate, Ion's philosophical work, the *Triagmos/Triagmoi* causes further problems for this particular compartmentalized role. Consider West's account of the relationship between the philosophical work, the *Epidemiai* and the implications for Ion's visits to Athens:

³⁹ Misch (1950) 1.98 after Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: "These pictures are the work, of course, of an Ionian, and 'no Athenian or Western Hellene could have done them so well'".

⁴⁰ Warren (forthcoming): "Diogenes is not an author who makes his own presence felt strongly within the text. He gives no indication of his own biography, where he is working, or any personal philosophical allegiance". Consider, again, my analogous *exemplum*, Heraclides. See Gottschalk (1980) 31 on the dramatic context of his dialogue on the day of Empedocles' death: "If Heraclides invented the conversation himself and did not merely repeat a pleasing anecdote from the traditional repertoire, he must have intended it to be a vehicle for his own beliefs about the nature and value of philosophy".

⁴¹ Diogenes' epigrams begin Mejer's section on "Diogenes' Personality" (1978: 46–59).

⁴² Against the 'anti' view, see Sandbach (1958–9). Does Ion's philosophically-based poem mean that Diogenes is less "unique"—according to Mejer (1978) 46?

[T]he *Triagmoi* was a late work. I should guess that it was composed at Athens not long before Ion's death. It was there that he was most likely to experience the stimulus to write a philosophical treatise. And if he had worked out these ideas before writing the *Epidemiai*, the latter might have been cast in a more systematic form; we might have expected to see clearer traces of an attempt to apply the philosophical doctrine to the assessment of the men Ion described. If his observations about the similar effects of σοφία and τύχη in F17 [118* Leurini = 36B3 DK = FGrH 392 F17a, 17b = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d; cf. *Quaest. conv.* 717b] stood in the *Epidemiai*, they were probably a casual reflection prompted by some particular case, not a moral set over the whole work. I see in them a prefiguration of the universal theory propounded in the *Triagmoi*.⁴³

West's attempt to map Ion's later literary career raises the important question of the relationship between biography and philosophy in our author's life and work. Nevertheless, the trail of Socrates' visit to Samos with Archelaus that brings Diogenes from Ionian physicists to Athenian ethical philosophers could have been a transition that made an impression on Ion's philosophical work. The opening to the *Triagmos*, which once was read as a statement of cosmological intent, has been reclaimed for ethical observation.⁴⁴ However, this mock-physics *incipit* turns into ethics, as "[a]n ancient reader, taking up the Τριαγμός for the first time, could hardly fail to assume... that Ion was speaking, as others had done before him, of the fundamental elements of which all things were composed".⁴⁵ Although, at the other end of the scale, "concern with the *structure* of virtue is an interesting, though perhaps illusory, anticipation of Plato".⁴⁶

Nevertheless, despite this neat mapping of the doxographical implications of Ion's *Epidemiai* (Archelaus to Socrates, physics to ethics) on to Ion's own philosophical outlook, the main force behind West's quotation is the position of Athens as the centre for philosophical enquiry. This parochialism is, therefore, at the heart of the Platonic Socrates' stationary existence—and its antithesis in Ion's Socrates' *apodemia* is the basis for our polymath's brand of Ionian philosophy, as gestured towards in the *Epidemiai*.

⁴³ West (1985) 76.

⁴⁴ Flores (1991) 24–45.

⁴⁵ Dover (1986) 29. As assumed by 114 Leurini = FGrH 392 F24b = 36A6 [first text] = Isoc. *Antid.* 268.

⁴⁶ Dover (1986) 29.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

ION'S HYMN TO KAIROS

VICTORIA JENNINGS

Ion of Chios wrote a hymn to Kairos. Nothing survives but this 'title', attested six hundred years on by the periegete Pausanias. Writing of the Altis at Olympia, Pausanias reports that,

τῆς ἐσόδου δὲ τῆς ἐς τὸ στάδιον εἰσιν ἐγγύτατα βωμοὶ δύο· τὸν μὲν αὐτῶν Ἑρμοῦ καλοῦσιν Ἐναγωνίου, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον Καιροῦ. Ἴωνι δὲ οἶδα τῷ Χίῳ καὶ ὕμνον πεποιημένον Καιροῦ· γενεαλογεῖ δὲ ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ νεώτατον παίδων Διὸς Καιρὸν εἶναι.

Quite close to the entrance to the stadium are two altars; one they call the altar of Hermes of the Games, the other the altar of Kairos. I know that a hymn to Kairos was created by Ion of Chios; in the hymn Kairos is made out to be the youngest child of Zeus.

(87 Leurini = 742 *PMG* = Paus. 5.14.9).¹

Pausanias' detailed account of the almost seventy altars at Olympia frustrates:

¹ Translations of Pausanias are taken from Jones and Ormerod (1926) (with minor adaptations). *oída*, "I know", is used elsewhere with this sense: 3.26.2 (I know that Alcman says in a song...); cf. 1.43.1; 2.35.1; 3.26.10; 4.2.1; 4.30.4; 4.35.11; 9.27.2; 10.26.1; 10.31.3; 10.32.8. Note Pausanias' neutral reference to "Ion of Chios". In the infamous passage where Pausanias discovers that Ion's genealogy of the Chians does not answer his question about their Ionianism, Ion is "the tragedian" (7.4.8); cf. Dusanic (1999) 11. See Blanshard and Olding in this volume. The slippage is telling: Pausanias disliked tragedians and was irked by poets like Sappho who "made many inconsistent references to Eros in her poems" (9.27.3 = fr. 198, tr. Campbell). See Pelling in this volume on the nuances of Plutarch's labellings of Ion, notably in 109* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F15 = *Per.* 5.3–4 where Ion is brushed off as someone with a tragedian's expectations of people. Pausanias favours genealogies (Musti in Chamoux 1996: 76; Bowie 1996: 229) and epic material ("...I read the poem called the *Eoeae* and the epic called the *Naupactia*, and, moreover, all the genealogies composed by Cinaethon and Asius": 4.2.1; note too his praise of the Orphic Hymns as next to Homer in rank: 9.30.12—see Habicht 1985: 133) over more blatantly artistic mythography: he ignores Euripides' *Ion* in his account of Ionia—see Chamoux (1996) 60; Bingen in Moggi (1996) 107; cf. Habicht (1985) 133; Veyne (1988) 45. What are we to make here of his use of *γενεαλογεῖ*?

The reader must remember that the altars have not been enumerated in the order in which they stand, but the order followed by my narrative is that followed by the Eleans in their sacrifices. (5.14.10)

My narrative (*logos*) will follow in dealing with them the order in which the Eleans are wont to sacrifice on the altars. (5.14.4)²

Each month the Eleans sacrifice once on all the altars I have enumerated. (5.15.10)

The traditional words spoken by them in the Town Hall at the libations, and the hymns (*hymnoi*) which they sing, it were not right for me to introduce into my narrative. (5.15.11)

Inscriptions attest to the cult personnel of these sacrifices in “an ancient manner” (5.15.10), as Pausanias’ guide makes us aware.³ Nevertheless, Pausanias’ liturgical, ritual, phenomenological topography has made locating these altars very challenging⁴—a challenge exacerbated by the cluttered physical topography of these pre-eminent sites.⁵ Supposedly, there was an altar to Kairos near the entrance to the stadium that was used by officials and competitors: it was on the north east of the precinct, between the rows of treasuries and statues of Zanes to the north, and the Echo Stoa to the south. No identifiable trace remains.⁶

Why—and when—was there an altar to Kairos at Olympia? Ion’s hymn is the earliest extant literary reference to this abstract personifi-

² See Elsner (2001a); cf. Morgan (1990) 55–6.

³ Etienne (1992) attempts a reconstruction of the procession. Jones (2001) 35–7 discusses cult personnel on inscriptions from the 30s BC to the late third century AD; cf. Gardiner (1925) 199–203. On Pausanias’ “exegete”, our only named guide (5.20.4), see Jones (2001) 35–7; Chamoux (1996) 59; Habicht (1985) 145–6; cf. Veyne (1988) 76.

⁴ As Morgan (1990) 42 notes, we also cannot securely date these cults; but Pausanias’ accuracy can most likely be assumed: Habicht (1984) 55–6, (1985) 32ff., 77n48; Arafat (1992) 389; Rubinstein (1995) 211. “Phenomenological”: Elsner (2001a) 5, (2000) 53–6, (1995) 135–7 (p. 136: “a more important, more meaningful arrangement of space than mere juncture”); cf. Alcock (1996) 245. Pausanias’ “topographical” narrative juxtaposes “events or monuments of quite different periods, giving the impression that they nevertheless belong closely together”: Bowie (1996) 213. Even Wilamowitz-Moellendorf was stumped by Pausanias’ extraordinary Olympian geography—and consequently black-listed him from scholarly appreciation for a century: Habicht (1985) Appendix I.

⁵ A “wearisome” profusion: Wycherley (1962) 96. Cf. Millett (1998) 213 on the Athenian agora: “hundreds (if not thousands) of inscribed *stelai* standing in front of the monuments and buildings”. Moreover, Pausanias notes excavations at Olympia in his own time: 5.20.8–9.

⁶ Mallwitz (1988) 91–3 discusses how few altars can be located: an altar to Artemis is located by (non-specific) debris and identified by inscription on a later Roman altar; the site of the ash Great Altar of Zeus, to which Pausanias frequently returns in his criss-crossings of the site, is only approximate (pp. 92–3 and n58). See Herrmann (1992) for the (dubious) identification of Treasury VIII as an altar.

cation.⁷ As noted, we possess only a late attestation of the title.⁸ Furthermore, comparable evidence is meagre. The antiquarian-oriented poet Antimachus named one of Adrastus' horses "Kairos";⁹ a fragment suggests that Menander made *kairos* a god.¹⁰ Literary evidence rapidly

⁷ Personifications in 'hymns' are not unusual (in Pindar, for example, see Race 1997: 18): Ion's choice of Kairos is. Greek personifications (archaic to fourth century): Abel (1943); Webster (1954); Robertson (1964) 45–60; Ostwald (1969) 63–8; Shapiro (1993); Parker (1996) 227–42; Stafford (1998); Smith (1999); Stafford (2000); Blanshard (2004); Stafford and Herrin (2005). See also Haworth (1980) 44–50; Dawson (1992) 3–6; Paxson (1994).

⁸ The survival rate of hymns is poor: Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.5–6. Pritchett (1999) 317–8 provides a list of Pausanias' uses of *hymnoi*, mostly from literary contexts. T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835 attributes *hymnoi* to Ion, but none are extant (see, however, 120 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F53c = Phot. α 1304 with Leurini 1984: 167). Ion uses the word *hymnos* in two tragic fragments: 26ab Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F22–23 = Ath. 634ef, 634ce, from *Omphale*, implies that $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ | $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ ("ancient *hymnoi*") will be sung in a sympotic setting by Lydian harpists; in 42 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F39 = Ath. 184f–185a (from *Phoenix* or *Kaineus*) an aulos, in this case, the equivalent of a rooster ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\rho$) sounds a Lydian *hymnos*. Such references caution us against the Alexandrian generic assumptions (see Harvey 1955) that we may be tempted to impose upon Ion's *Hymn*/hymn—wherein "hymn" is genus *and* species (Furley 1993: 23n7). While I have preferred to seek a broader context from Pausanias' meagre reference, we should note that Ion's experimental forays in different literary forms well situate him within contemporary interests in typological contextualization expressed in familiar, "evaluative" vocabulary, but with new, "technical" senses. See Ford (2002) 10–22 on this, on the "song about genre", and on the significance of *kairos*—"Kairos governs genres"—in aesthetic criticism in the fifth century; see also Usher 2004. The "New Simonides" Plataea elegy (10 West—18 West), with its hymnic introduction and manipulation of traditional features which "smacks of later Hellenistic genre-crossing" (Obbink 2001: 66, cf. pp. 84–5) is one persuasive case for "reorienting our thinking about early Greek poetry" (p. 65)—"One wonders how many generic boundaries (if we could be sure they then existed) Simonides might have been prepared to cross in the same poem" (p. 85). See, too, Wilson (1997) 107 on generic mixing in Bacchylides' dithyrambs. With regard to hymns, note Bartol (2000) on Ion's manipulation of hymnic conventions in elegy 90 Leurini = 27 West = Ath. 463ac, 496c. See, too, Race (1990) 85–117 on Pindaric hymnic strategies; Obbink (p. 73) on Empedocles 31B35 DK (with Sedley 1989: 287–95); cf. Furley (1993) 38–9 and Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.47 on (later) philosophers' hymns. Performance is, of course, the key: hymns have a place in a variety of (multiple) performance contexts (Furley 1993: 24; Depew 2000: 59–61), and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Ion's "hymn" (length, metre, context unknown) was as innovative as its subject-matter. Ion's innovation is later standardized: note Menander Rhetor's "fictitious" category of hymns ("when we personify a god", 333.21–2), "a sign of inventiveness" (342.19–20: Russell and Wilson 1981: 7, 21–5; cf. Bremer 1995).

⁹ Paus. 8.25.9 (Antimachus fr. 32 Wyss). There are two horses: Kairos and Areion. See Sauer (1890–94) 901. Again, Pausanias has hunted out the obscure, 'antiquarian' author.

¹⁰ Palladas *ap. Anth. Pal.* 10.52 = Menander fr. 512 *PCG*.

reduces us to supposition.¹¹ Certainly, there is nothing odd about an altar to Zeus' son—however obscure—in Zeus' sanctuary: Poseidon's children, the Cyclopes, have an altar in his Isthmian sanctuary.¹² Moreover, a cult of *Olympian Kairos* existed at Velia—Elea—in Italy, in the mid-fifth century.¹³ Did it emulate a cult at Olympia?¹⁴ Was Ion's *Hymn to Kairos* an *agalma* offered to this cult's instantiation at Olympia, at this altar?¹⁵ There is a hint that a now-lost sculpted Kairos, by Polyclitus,

¹¹ We note the personified Kairos of lyric adespota 11 (*Cassandrae Oracula ap. Collectanea Alexandrina*: Powell 1925, 188–90). See Stafford (1998) 55n14 on Alexander Rhetor *De figuris* 19.14 (in a section on *prosopopoeia*) on a 'personified' Kairos in Demosthenes *Olynthiacs* 1.2: "Athenians! The present *kairos* calls on you almost with an audible voice".

¹² Paus. 2.2.1: Gebhard (1993) 154.

¹³ A Phocian colony: see OCD³ s.v. Elea, OCD³ s.v. Kairos; LIMC s.v. Kairos, 921. The inscription is on a *cippo* (boundary stone). Guarducci (1966) dates it to a little after the mid-fifth century; see also Carratelli (1970); Leurini (1973). The deity appears to be a protector of navigation. As Trédé (1992) 143–4 asks (after Carratelli 1970), is this "*Kairos* the Olympian" or "*Kairos* of Olympia"? Divine location is extremely significant in hymns: Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.54–5.

¹⁴ Morgan (1990) 42: Olympia as "a role model for emulation".

¹⁵ Suggested by Benndorf (1885); Sauer (1890–94) 898; Cook (1925b) 859. Guarducci (1966) 288–9 suggests a date of composition c. 445–441. An altar is the central focus of cult: Sourvinou-Inwood (1993) 9–10; Tomlinson (1976) 16–8. In Proclus' "canonical" (and problematic) definition, "the true hymn was sung to the lyre while standing (sc. round an altar)": Phot. *Bibl.* 320a19–20; see Furley (1993) 23; for example, *στάντες... ἄμφω βωμὸν* in the "Cretan Hymn to the Kouros": West (1965); Bowra (1966); Bremer (1981) 205–6. Hymn as *agalma*: see Depew (2000) 65–77 who emphasizes community involvement in the (agonistic) hymnic "process". See also Steiner (1994) 90–8 (Theognidean and Pindaric *agalmata*); Pulleyn (1997) 49–50, 55: hymns as "negotiable commodities". Cf. Appadurai (1986b) on the rhetorical, cultural and social significance of "tournaments of value". More concretely, Sophocles is credited with the establishment of (inscribed) altars: Connolly (1998) 4–5. From Paus. 5.15.11, quoted at the beginning of my paper, one might assume that Ion's hymn was not (or no longer) used at this altar; was it, in fact, a 'real', liturgical hymn, or a 'literary' (and/or rhapsodic?) one? The breakdown between the categories perhaps ought not be so firm given the amount of new hymnic material in production each year, the "adaptability" of hymns "in spite of their stereotypical formulas" (Race 1992: 19, 29–34), the potential adaptation and polishing of the traditional (see Bremer 1981: 196, 198–200; Bowra 1966: 43–4), and the cross-over of hymns into other 'genres', notably tragedy. Disregarding "poetic intention", Bremer suggests that, "One might even be tempted to state that these texts were used in cult: were these festivals not organized in honour of Dionysus and celebrated in his precinct...?" (p. 213). See Furley (1993) 39 on Euripidean hymning of abstractions in tragedy; and Furley and Bremer (2001) 1: chapters 8–11 for a selection of examples drawn from drama. As Easterling (1985) 35 notes, "the 'sacred'/'secular' distinction [is] very difficult to apply"; "incense, altars, and hymns are as much a feature of the symposium as of the sacrifice": Parker (1993) 346. Pulleyn (1997) 4n5 remarks similarly on false distinctions between "literature" and "life" ("In fact, the two must have interacted in a very complex manner"), noting "highly wrought" hymns inscribed for posterity within sanctuaries and functioning simultaneously in cult (p. 3; cf. p. 48n3; survivals are generally from the fourth cen-

stood here too. Let us also remember the massive redevelopment of Olympia in the mid-fifth century, with the moving of the stadium 75 metres east allowing for renewed embellishment of this area. Individually, these snippets might be nugatory, but their cumulative effect is not, and certainly the chronological agreement is tantalizing.¹⁶

But why Kairos? Is there something about *kairos* that makes it—or him—particularly appropriate for a prominent corner in one of the most significant sites in the ancient world? What might *kairos* signify to Ion and at Olympia?

Kairos is commonly translated as “opportunity”. This is a later sense; indeed, *kairos* eventually becomes synonymous with *chronos* or time,¹⁷ and, as such, it is understandable why it is often associated with precise arts like chariot-racing, navigation, medicine and cooking.¹⁸ Before the fourth century, *kairos* was one of the “most...elusive...words in Greek”:¹⁹ it had little overt temporal significance, but enormous “normative” import. In fifth century sources, *kairos*’ “timeliness” rather suggests “propriety”—due measure, proper amount, appositeness, efficacy and brevity, what is appropriate, what is right, what matters. Sources connect *kairos*,

ture onwards). The distinction between personal and cultic in the personal yet “public hymns” (Furley 1995: 30) of lyric poetry creates a further blurring.

¹⁶ Polyclitus’ *floruit*: last forty years of the fifth century. On the chronology of the stadium/tunnel architecture see Schillbach (1992): Stadium I, mid-sixth century; II, c. 500; IIIA (75 metres east of II), 465–455 (*Zeus’ temple completed in 458*); IIIB, 367/6–360; IIIC, 340–330 (Echo Hall); IIID, c. 200 (tunnel); IIIE, last quarter first century; IIIF, second quarter third century AD. The so-called “hidden entrance”, a vaulted tunnel (Paus. 6.20.8); Dinsmoor (1950) 319; cf. the Nemean tunnel: Miller (1992) 84–5.

¹⁷ Opportunity: cf. Rose in OCD² s.v. Kairos, “opportunity is god-sent”. The earliest sense is Homeric and is used, for example, of a critical wound: Race (1981) 197. Time: LSJ s.v. *kairos* III. Cf. the “Kairos Prison Ministry”, for those doing “God’s Special Time” (www.kairosprisonministry.org). According to Cook (1925b) 861, Kairos becomes his own grandfather; eventually Kairos becomes Bios “on his roller skates” (the *fleetingness of life?*): Cook, pp. 864ff.; cf. LIMC s.v. Kairos: 921, 926. Intriguingly, on an eighteenth century Chian fresco, a Kairos-as-Bios stands over a figure pouring wine from a skin into a large vessel: LIMC s.v. Kairos, p.924 (fig. 17). *Chronos* also possesses a ready anthropomorphic plasticity: cf. Pind. *N.* 1.46–7 with Gerber (1962); on Time personified, see de Romilly (1968); for example, Euripides *Aiolos TrGF* **38a: “*Chronos* will explain all to later generations, for time is talkative and speaks even without being asked”; cf. Euenus fr. 9a West: “*Chronos* is both wisest and most stupid”.

¹⁸ Cooking and navigation: Trédé (1992) 144, see also pp. 149ff., 191ff. on *kairos* in medicine and war. Navigation: Détienne and Vernant (1978) 223–5; Détienne (1981b) 20–3; cf. Kairos at Velia, a city “reliant on...fishing” as well as agriculture: OCD³ s.v. Elea. Charioteering: Détienne and Vernant (1978) 15–6 on the horse race (and pp. 202–3 on Antimachus’ horsy Kairos).

¹⁹ Race (1981) 197, 212; Aristophanes, and particularly Menander, mark the change. The following description of *kairos* in the fifth century is indebted to Race’s account.

gnomically, with other normative terms, notably *metron* (due measure) and *dike* (justice).²⁰ At Olympia, near Hermes *Enagonios*,²¹ the athletic connection immediate through sheer proximity is reinforced by these senses of “due measure”, “critical moment”—even “opportunity”²²—for the athlete whose race finishes facing the sacred precinct, and this altar. “Propriety” is further emphasized in the metonymic topography of the approach to the stadium: after taking their oaths, as well as passing the Kairos altar, the procession of athletes and officials in Pausanias’ day passed the Zanes, statues of Zeus erected from fines levied against cheats—more timely reminders.²³

Kairos was something of a Sophistic buzz-word. Once again, chronology provokes a question: was Ion in Athens—that other great panhellenic centre²⁴—when Gorgias visited in 427? A work *Peri Kairou*

²⁰ Ford (2002) 18–9 notes that while “evaluative terms that had had a moral and social force took on additional technical meanings in the fifth century... [t]he old meanings of *prepon*, *metron*, and *kairos* continued alongside the new”. Measure, justice: Hesiod *Works & Days* 694 with Trédé (1992) 63–7, 83–96; Guillaud (1988) 368–70; Wilson (1980); Des Places (1969) 345; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 13.47–8. Note too Pittacus’ *kairon gnothi*: D. L. 1.79; Gentili (1988) 280n81. Other *kairos*-related *gnomica* are found among the sententiae of the Seven Sages: see Trédé (1992) 57–8. Ion raids the gnomic store for *gnothi sauton* in 70ab* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 FF58, 55 = Plut. *Dem.* 3.2; *Cons. ad. Apoll.* 116d; Olympiod. *Comm. in Plat. Alc.* 129a (201, p. 126 Westerink); Schol. *Plat. Alc.* 129a; see Rostagni (1927).

²¹ Hermes who *contests* or *presides* over the Games. Hermes had a long association with athletics and, in particular, the palaestra: Farnell (1909) 28–30; cf. Stuart Jones (1966) 203 (following Curtius 1876).

²² Wilson (1981): can *kairos* imply “profit”? The implication of physical and mental *kairos* reminds one of Lucian’s application of *kairos* to the dancer, immediately prior to elaborating the dancer’s physical conformation to Polyclitus’ canon: *Saltatio* 74–5; see Montiglio (1999) 268.

²³ Raschke (1988b): even the pedimental sculptures of the Temple of Zeus articulate “the anxiety of the moment” in a pre-race scene. Cf. Miller (1992) 85. Olympia has been described as “a combination of Wembley Stadium and Westminster Abbey”: Swaddling (1999) 7. The Zanes were not present in Ion’s time: Paus. 5.21.15; Tomlinson (1976) 63 (“deliberate and appropriate” positioning).

²⁴ There are two inscriptions—one once ascribed to Ion, and another by Ion of Samos (once considered “the earliest author’s name on a stone”: Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948: 68n9; cf. Cameron 1993: 1). Even if they are not Ion’s work, they illustrate the “theatrical” pull of these great sites of shared cultural memory as *loci* of self-display and memorialization: the first, a dedication on the Athenian Acropolis in Ionic dialect (*IG* I² 604; see Kirchhoff 1871: 59–60; Frazer 1898: 3.564; Roberts and Gardner 1887–1905: 2.440; Raubitschek and Jeffery 1949 no. 119; Gentili and Prato 1985: 64); the second, Lysander’s Aegospotami monument at Delphi (Ion of Samos: *CEG* 2.224–8, no. 819). Cf. an “Ion” (?) at Delphi in *Fouilles de Delphes* III. 1 no. 51: Bousquet 1966; or the ascription to Ion of the Coronea epigram 153*** Leurini = *IG* I³ 1163.34–41 (see Griffith 1988); or Cimon’s Eion epigrams (see below). These inscriptional ascrip-

is ascribed to Gorgias, and it is conjectured that he was the first to produce such.²⁵ *Kairos* is all-important for the orators: in the rhetorical manuals, *kairos* stresses the importance of the “à-propos”.²⁶ in subject, in timing, in delivery, in audience—in everything.²⁷ Asked to speak at a drinking party, Isocrates allegedly replied, “What I excel (*deinos*) in suits not the present *kairos*; in what suits the present *kairos*, I do not excel” (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 613a). This gloriously rhetorical, chiasmic “speech event”²⁸ is *apropos* Isocrates the symposiast (clever, gnomic, scannable and befitting the sympotic moment);²⁹ and it is also *apropos* Isocrates the

tions often demonstrate the ancient and the modern scholar’s desire to link a name to a text, regardless of anachronism (cf. Knight 2000: 92): for example, 138*** Leurini = *AP* 7.43 or 139*** Leurini = *AP* 7.44—“Ion” [of Samos? of Ephesus?] on Euripides’ death; cf. “Ion” preferred to “Dion” in 141*** Leurini = *Ath.* 638a: see Nieberding (1836) 52; von Blumenthal (1939) 55. See Morgan (1994) on Phaedrus’ offer to set up (golden) statues of Socrates at Delphi and/or Olympia (*Pl. Phdr.* 235cd, 236ab), an “offer” which, while reflecting disapproval of Gorgias’ golden statue at Delphi (Paus. 10.18.7; *Ath.* 505de), might also be seen as agonistically appropriate. The attraction remains constant: as Alcock (1993) 191 notes of Roman Olympia, “gestures made here could not fail to be noticed”. Cf. Stevens in this volume on the Chian installation at Delphi (*Fouilles de Delphes* III. 3 no. 212). Note Paus. 10.7.2 on hymn-singing as the oldest competitive event with prizes at Delphi: Furley (1993) 35; see Bremer (1995) 518–20 who doubts that hymns/paeans as *cult-songs* were performed for prizes at Greek festivals; dithyramb is swept into the agonistic, literary category.

²⁵ 82B13 DK = Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De compositione verborum* 12. See Kerferd (1981) 82, 45 (*On the Right Moment in Time*). Other commentators are less keen to view this as programmatic to his *techné*: for example, Noël (1998); Robinson (1979) 65f. Cf. O’Sullivan (1996) 122 on Gorgias’ alleged reliance on the inspiration of the moment (*kairos*): 82A24 DK. We note that Democritus wrote an *Aitiaí peri akairion kai epikairion*.

²⁶ This translation of *kairos* belongs to Trédé (1992). *Kairos* becomes feminized as Latin *occasio*: Cook (1925b) 862. The personification of an abstraction as (adult) male is uncommon in Greek: Stafford (1998); Smith (1991) 66.

²⁷ Burton (1996–).

²⁸ Russo (1997) 49.

²⁹ Cf. Ford (2002) 192 on Sophocles’ *kairos* in 104 Leurini = *FGH* 392 F6 = *Ath.* 603e–604d. As such, a *Hymn to Kairos* would also befit the symposium, where measure and appropriateness are all-important (for example, Xenophanes 21B1 DK): see Katsaros in this volume. This setting would encourage a more “personal” element to the hymn: Furley (1993) 30–1. Performance of predominantly lyric hymns is part of the symposium: Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.32n93 categorize 90 Leurini = 27 West = *Ath.* 463ac, 496c as scolic and sympotic prayer-hymn; see Bartol (2000). Cf. Gentili (1988) 280n81: “oral discourse shows a structure arising out of the occasion or performance situation, and in direct response to the expectations of the audience”. Seizing the kairotic moment is the most significant feature of gnomic utterances: Russo (1997) 58. Note the riddling re-working of this trope in adesp. eleg. fr. 23 West (Agathon? Stob. 1.8.16 W-H): “Would that a hidden (*aphanes*) opportunity (*kairos*) might thus be perfectly clear (*phanerotatos*)...” (tr. Gerber).

orator seizing the kairotic moment to land the knock-out punch.³⁰ The anecdote about Ion's meeting with Aeschylus illustrates the significance given to the *apropos*:

Aeschylus at the Isthmian games was watching a boxing-match, and when one of the men was hit the crowd in the theatre burst into a roar. Aeschylus nudged (νύξας) Ion of Chios, and said, "You see what a thing training is; the man who is hit says nothing; it is the spectators who shout".

(108* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F22 = Plut. *De prof. virt.* 79de, *Quomodo adul.* 29f; Stob. 3.29.89 W-H; tr. Babbitt)³¹

Perhaps Ion and Gorgias did encounter each other on the festival circuit.³² The great cycle of Games was a focus for intellectual display, with Olympia attracting the widest possible panhellenic audience: we note the anecdotes about Hippias going to Olympia laden with material; or Cleomenes reciting Empedocles.³³ The Gorgias/Olympia link is strong too.³⁴ However we define "hymn",³⁵ producing a poetic work

³⁰ *Kairos* in the orators: Trédé (1992) 260–82; Usher (2004). Isocratean *kairos*: Haskins (2004) Chapter 3; cf. North (1966) 148 on Isocrates *Against the Sophists* 13 (*kairos* and *prepon*) and *Panathenaicus* 85 (*kairos* and *metriotes*). Note *Dissoi Logoi* 2.19–20.

³¹ Dated between 465–456: Avezzù (1989) 153–5. West (1985) 71: 464/2/0.

³² The cross-pollination of ideas between mainland and island Greece and Southern Italy is also facilitated by Athens' place as a cross-cultural travel "hub": for example, Dougherty (2003). According to Plato's *Parmenides* (127cd), another visitor to Athens c. 450 BC was Parmenides of Elea (Velia) who (like Ion?) met the *neos* Socrates: Curd (1998) 15–6. Ion and Socrates: 111* Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F9 = D. L. 2.23 (on a Pythagorean pilgrimage?); see Fletcher in this volume. Parmenides, too, presents as the traveller (even if 28B1.3 DK is not literal): Burnet (1945) 169, 172n1; Tarán (1965) 11–2; he is linked with Pythagorean thought (without much success; cf. West 1971b on Stesichorus and Magna Graecia): Barnes (1987) 129; Coxon (1986) 18–9, 170; and engages with his poetic—as well as philosophic—predecessors: see Mourelatos (1970) Chapter 1 on Parmenides' Homerisms. On Ion's engagement with Homer, see Stevens in this volume, and note 51 below.

³³ In general, Kokolakis (1992). Unlike the Pythian, the Olympic festival did not foreground artistic contest, but such displays indubitably occurred on the fringes. See O'Sullivan (1996) on sophists dressed like rhapsodes at the festivals. There is much anecdotal material: Thales dying of sunstroke at Olympia. Did Herodotus read his work there? Cf. Swaddling (1999) 48, 96. Hippias: for example, Plato *Hippias Minor* 363cd, 368cd (with "poems...epics, tragedies and dithyrambs"); cf. O'Sullivan (1996) 116, who notes that these do not have to be Hippias' *own* works—he may have given technical expositions on other poets. Cleomenes: D. L. 8.63; Ath. 620d; Kokolakis (1992) 153; cf. the tyrant Dionysius of Syracuse sending rhapsodes to Olympia to read his (lousy) poems (Diodorus Siculus 14.109). Bowie (2001b) 29: Pausanias read his work there? See Habicht (1985) 8.

³⁴ For example, Olympic Orations (c. 408, 400 or 392); Paus. 6.17.7: a statue of Gorgias, with an epigram, erected by a descendant.

³⁵ Cf. Pl. *Laws* 700ab and *Rep.* 607a. Obbink (2001) 73: the hymnic *prooimion* "seems to have served to contextualize the performance within a public festival"; cf. Furley

at Olympia demonstrates, in itself, a sure grasp of the peculiarly Greek kairotic moment for “verbal performance of wisdom”,³⁶ and accords well with the concept of Ion as a man at home in the context and content of his age of competitiveness.³⁷ Hermes *Enagonios* can be Hermes of *agones* other than the purely athletic.³⁸

And is not *kairos* also a brilliant deity for the poet in the contest or celebrating the contest: Pindar—who *seems* to have escaped Ion’s ruthless social reportage³⁹—exemplifies the use of *kairos* as a poetic device of abbreviation or “*rupture*” in his victory odes.⁴⁰ this sense of “just enough and no more”⁴¹ is also picked up by the sophists, masters of the *ex tempore*, the *epi kairou*.⁴² Pindar’s references to *kairos* offer neat

(1993) 25–8; Bremer (1981) 203, (1998) 518. There is tremendous honour attached to these performances: see Gentili (1988) 139 and Furley (1993) 34 on Pind. *Paeon* 6, performed at a Delphic theoxeny with a choir brought by Pindar himself. Incidentally, T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835 ascribes paeans to Ion: see Faerber (1940a) 669; the paean was also sung at the symposium: see Harvey (1955) 172.

³⁶ Russo (1997) 63. Olympia is, according to Pindar, “shared by all” (*pankoinon*: *Ol.* 6.63). Note Paus. 5.10.1: “Many are the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be heard; but on nothing does god bestow more care than on the Eleusinian rites and the Olympic games”. Olympia is exceptionally significant to Pausanias—and structurally central to his text: Elsner (2001a) 6.

³⁷ van Nijf (2000) 307: “we should not forget that the entire corpus of Greek drama originated in an agonistic context”. Ion presented tragedies and dithyrambs at the Dionysia (T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = *Suda* 1 487; T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835), and won victories (T6 Leurini = *TrGF* DID C 13 = Argum. Eur. *Hipp.* 2; T12 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 T3 = Ath. 3f; *Suda* α 731).

³⁸ Yalouris (1982) 80 notes the personification of *Agon* from the beginning of the fifth century (at Olympia: Paus. 5.20.3). On Hermes *Enagonios*, see Farnell (1909) 28. Allan (2005) suggests that the two altars ought to be understood together—is Kairos personified as the “son” of Hermes? I am grateful to Dr Allan for allowing me to read a pre-publication copy of her paper.

³⁹ Note 31 Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F29 = Ath. 411b: in *Omphale*, Ion borrowed Pindar’s portrayal of Heracles’ gluttony (Pind. fr. 168b Snell-Machler).

⁴⁰ *Rupture*: Trédé (1992) 106–16.

⁴¹ Cf. *Pythian* 1.81–2 (written for Hieron of Aitna, victor in the chariot race): “If you should speak to the point (*kairon*) by combining the strands of many things in brief, less criticism follows from men, for cloying excess dulls eager expectations...” (tr. Race). See Race (1981) 202; Montiglio (2000) 106–11; Trédé (1992) 97–138.

⁴² LSJ s.v. *kairos* III: cf. Guillaumaud (1988) 360ff. See Noël (1998) on *brachylogie/macrologie* in Gorgias and Protagoras—for whom *kairos* was a “power” [*dunamis*]: 80A1 DK = D. L. 9.52; Guillaumaud (1988) 366; cf. Prodicus in Pl. *Phdr.* 267a6–b5 on not speaking at length or too briefly but in due measure (*metrion*): Guillaumaud (1988) 362; Trédé (1992) 107–8. Protagoras: D. L. 9.52—“he first distinguished and defined (?) parts of time [*chronos*] and set forth the importance of *kairos*” (tr. Pfeiffer). Pfeiffer (1968) 38 offers a rhetorical context. Gorgias: as above and North (1966) 93 on “Gorgias’ favorite principle”. Note Race (1982) 14 on the “rhetorical intention” underlying the “formal expression of that intention”.

metatextual comment on poems and poet, as in *Pythian* 9.78–80: in *kairos* lies the perfection of all things.⁴³

The qualitative and quantitative, moral and aesthetic senses of *kairos* might combine rather neatly in circumstances in which the poet is forced to work to order for (in Pindar's case) those Southern Italian patrons with the awkward convictions we class hesitantly as 'Orphic/Pythagorean'. Pindar cleverly glosses un-Olympian thoughts (for example, *Ol.* 2.56–80),⁴⁴ but I wonder if Ion is more receptive to the radical. Taking on board the perspectives offered by Baltussen in this volume, let us widen our purview beyond fragments austere classed as 'philosophical' in Diels-Kranz; and let us ask to what extent do these quasi-Pythagorean 'attitudes' permeate Ion's other 'literary' work?

Ion states that Pythagoras produced writings under the name of Orpheus (116 Leurini = 36 B2 DK = Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.131; D. L. 8.8).⁴⁵ Ion mentions Pythagoras in the elegiac epigram on Pherecydes (92 Leurini = 30 West = D. L. 1.120).⁴⁶ Even if we prefer to remain sceptical—as indeed we ought, given the potential pitfall of anachronism—or even if we read Ion as being ironic, or a sympotic smart aleck, we do well to note that we find *kairos* in Pythagorean contexts too, where, as Aristotle tells us, almost every concept can be expressed numerically. *Kairos* is defined as the virginal, Athena-like number seven: a number neither begetting nor begotten.⁴⁷ The broader 'numerical' aspect of

⁴³ Gentili (1988) 144, 280n81 suggests reading this *kairos* as personified; cf. Fränkel (1975) 447–8.

⁴⁴ See von Fritz (1957); Bluck (1958); McGibbon (1964); Defradas (1971); Demand (1975); Lloyd-Jones (1985), (1990b); Nisetich (1988); Jennings (1996); cf. Lavecchia (2000); Wilson (2002). Setting limits in Pindar (and the "organizing principle" of *kairos*): Montiglio (2000) 106, 108 and n134; "mediatory...between inadequacy and excess": Hubbard (1986) 41; Trédé (1992) 97–138; Walsh (1984) 44, 54–6.

⁴⁵ See Tannery (1897); Rathmann (1933) 43–6; West (1983c) 7–9; Burkert (1972) 129: "What Ion meant was that the real author of certain poems circulating under the name of Orpheus was Pythagoras—that the Ὀρφικά were Πυθαγόρεια. It was not works of Pythagoras that Ion knew, but Orphic poems whose origins he was trying to determine".

⁴⁶ With the 'punch-line' that Pherecydes would be reincarnated if Pythagoras was wise (*sophos*). Note Heraclitus' criticism of Pythagoras for *polymathia* (22B40 DK = D. L. 9.1); Burkert (1972) 130–1, 209–11. Sandbach (1958–59) views the Pherecydes' epigram as a "reply" to Heraclitus' criticisms. Both fragment 116 Leurini and this elegy are highly ambiguous—is Ion necessarily assigning praise? Is Ion's 'nice' epigram an exercise in sophistry? The literature is extensive: see Leurini (2000a) 75. Should it be read ironically? Rösler (1990) 233 asks thus of the Pherecydes epigram; cf. Quincey (1963) 146; Burkert (1972) 209–10.

⁴⁷ Huxley (1965) 39. LIMC s.v. Kairos, p. 921. It has a "carattere verginale" (relating to Athena). Leurini (1973): evidence for Kairos (= 7) and Poseidon (= 8) at Velia. Note

kairos is picked up less concretely in Pindar, the sophists and in Plato: *kairos* is “measure”, “symmetria”, “harmonia”.⁴⁸ This certainly calls to mind the fulsome use of numbers in Ion’s elegy on the eleven-stringed lyre with its ten “steps” (93 Leurini = 32 West = Cleonid. *Isag. harm.* 12, p. 202 Jan = Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius *Harmonica* p. 116 Jonker).⁴⁹ What of Ion’s fondness for ‘threes’?⁵⁰ Does this go beyond Homerically-inspired, Sophoclean-anticipated trichotomy?⁵¹ Does Ion take this to the parodic in *Omphale* with his satyric Heracles?—ascribing to him three sets of gnashing teeth which are proportionate

the numerous citations of *kair-* in Iambl. *VP*. On Pythagoreans and *kairos*, see Arist. *Met.* 985b23ff. (also 1078b21; tr. Ross): “such and such a modification of numbers being justice, another being soul and reason, another being opportunity (*kairos*)—and similarly almost all other things being numerically expressible”. Burkert (1972) 40, 467–8: other examples include 1 (*noos*/mind and *ousia*/being), 2 (*doxa*/opinion), 3 (number of the Whole: beginning, middle, end), 4 or 9 (justice = equal times equal), 5 (marriage = first combination of odd and even), 10 (perfect). Consider, too, the treatise *On Sevens*—variously dated to the time of Anaximander or Anaximenes; from Ionia: Burkert (1972) 290n63, 294; Sandbach (1958–59) compares *Triagmos* to this. Seven is of particular relevance to the planets—Burkert (1972) 473; Schibli (1990) 48n110—and was significant well before the Pythagoreans: for example, in Solon’s ages of man, and in the East.

⁴⁸ *Symmetria* and *harmonia* are significant features in Pindar’s work: Trédé (1992) 116–38. *Symmetria* in medicine and oratory: Trédé (1992): 67–70. Harmony is connected with Justice, her mother, who possesses “unfailing *kairos*”: Fränkel (1975) 498.

⁴⁹ See Power and Maitland in this volume. On the numerical and cosmic congruence of Pythagorean *harmonia*, see Burkert (1972) 351–2, 391ff.: for example, the seven-stringed lyre. Burkert notes that it is sometimes difficult to determine jest (p. 468n12); see Sandbach (1958–59) and Dover (1986) 31, who suggests that *Triagmos* is a *paigion*: “Ion wore his Pythagoreanism, such as it was, rather lightly” (p. 30).

⁵⁰ Webster (1936) 270–3.

⁵¹ Most graphically demonstrated by *TRIagmos*: Dover (1986) 29; cf. Usener (1903). One could go to extremes: tragedies come in threes?—note the debate on how many *tetralogies* are ascribed to Ion (12, 30 or 40? T4 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T1 = Suda 1 487; Lesky (1983) 394; Duncan (1939) 129 after Koepke (1836). A hymn is, generally, tripartite: Bremer (1981) 194–6; Furley and Bremer (2001) 1.51. (Later) Pythagorean “Hymn to Number”: fr. 309 Kern; West (1983c) 29. Homeric Sophoclean Ion: Duncan (1939) 137 finds an alleged tribute by Ion to Sophocles as *Homerikotatos*; see Schneidewin (1853). Cf. the similar remark of “Ion”/“a certain Ionian” in 129** Leurini = *FGrH* 392 F23 = *Vita Sophoclea* 20; von Leutsch (1846); Mähly (1889) 557; Marcovich (1971) 343. Webster (1936) 272–3 asks if Ion’s long words, hapaxlegomena and Homerisms are just early Sophoclean (cf. Leurini 1984: 170–1), and suggests that Sophocles’ use of a personified *kairos* “follows Ion” (pp. 266, 274). Language and location come together in the puzzle offered by Cimon’s Eion inscriptions: 140*** Leurini = Aeschin. *Ctesiph.* 183–5; Plut. *Cim.* 7.4–5. Dated c. 475, perhaps the time of Ion’s first meeting with Cimon, the language might suggest a very precocious Ion: see Schöll (1877) 149; Jacoby (1945) 210n193; Stadter (1989) 79, 262–3.

to his heroic appetite (29* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F*30 = Pollux 2.95; Tzet. *Chil.* 3.957–8).⁵²

Consider, too, Ion's pseudo-scientific interest in the night skies. What of Ion's three-plus fragments about the moon, notably the Philodemus papyrus in which Musaeus, that famous conceptual compatriot of Orpheus, is referred to as moon-fallen or moon-begotten (95* Leurini = [30A West] = Philodem. *De piet.* p. 13 Gomperz)⁵³—is this another example of Ionic irony? Or is Ion tapping into a strain of radical, semi-allegorizing religious thought that will culminate, almost contemporaneously, in the Derveni Papyrus?⁵⁴ It has been suggested that the worshipping of abstractions can allow a “certain autonomy from the world of the Olympians”.⁵⁵

What of Aristophanes' reference to Ion as the Morning Star and Ion's dithyramb on the topic (84 Leurini = 745 *PMG*; T7, T8, T11 Leurini = Ar. *Pax* 832–7, Schol. *ad loc.*, *Suda* δ 1029)?⁵⁶ Does this refer only, following the *Suda*, to the “celestial matters” which interested the

⁵² Inspired by Homer's Scylla (*Od.* 12.91)? See Leurini *ad loc.* and Maitland in this volume.

⁵³ “And Musaeus is said by Orpheus to have been her son (i.e. son of Selene); Ion calls him ‘moon-fallen’” (tr. Campbell); see Henrichs (1975) 14; West (1983a); Luppe (1984); Henrichs (1985). Other moon fragments: 117* Leurini = *FGH* 392 F26 = Aët. *Plac.* 2.25.11 (“a body partly of a translucent shiny nature, partly lightless”; see Baltussen in this volume); 72* Leurini = *TrGF* 19 F57 = Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 658c (“Dark clustered grapes are not matured by them [that is, the moon's rays]”, tr. Clement and Hoffleit) = *Fac. in orbe lun.* 929a. On Pythagoreans and the moon (and, later, seven planets), see Burkert (1972) 310ff., 351–2.

⁵⁴ See, in particular, Janko (2001) 1–15 on the Derveni papyrus' Ionian features, “the extraordinary mixture of piety and science”, the author's sophistication and sophistic characteristics, and its possible authorship by Diagoras of Melos (“a lyric poet and a philosopher”) who, like Ion, seems to have favoured obscure book titles and maintained an interest in *tyche* and Orpheus (Orphic *Hymns*...) and cosmic speculation (with, perhaps, some Pythagorean background?) and dithyramb. Ion's book-titles: *Triagmos*; on *Sunekdemetikos* (as *Epidemiai*? as *Hypomnemata*? as *Presbeutikos*? as *comedy*?) see 113 Leurini = *FGH* 392 F8 = Pollux 2.88 (σπανοπώγων, “with scanty beard”: LSJ); on which rare word see Leurini (2000a) 73 (on *Presbeutikos* and *Hypomnemata* see Leurini, p. 85). Cosmic interests: note *Kosmologikos* (= *Triagmos*?) ascribed to Ion in T8 Leurini = *FGH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835; see Flores (1991) 26ff. with Leurini (2000a) 84 and Baltussen in this volume. Even if we are not prepared to label Ion a Pythagorean or radical religious thinker, there is no doubt that he was a learned man from a learned Ionian environment. Ion does not have to ‘be’ a Pythagorean: as Leurini (1973) 209 writes of the puzzle that is Kairos at Velia/Elea, “anche Parmenide, prima che il fondatore della scuola eleatica, sarebbe stato un pitagorico”. See Raven (1948) 83–5 on Ion's (Pythagorean) “three”, Xuthus and the Eleatic “One”.

⁵⁵ Parker (1996) 236—although the trappings remain the same: p. 237.

⁵⁶ See Henderson in this volume.

dithyrambic poets?⁵⁷ Should we consider notions of 'Pythagorean cosmic harmony' even while we remember that these ideas most likely post-date Ion?⁵⁸ What of Xuthus-the-Pythagorean as father of Ion, postulated by Dover?⁵⁹ What of the connection between *kairos* and appropriate silence, "widespread in Greek culture"⁶⁰—and Pythagorean silence?⁶¹ What of verbal echoes of Empedocles' Pythagoras in Ion's elegy 89 Leurini = 26 West = Ath. 447d?⁶² What *is* the lost (Pythagorean?) context of the epigram on Pherecydes (above)?

These are what we might term "incidental intertextualities",⁶³ but if we think about music and mathematics and proportion and harmony,⁶⁴ we might find ourselves back at Olympia, at my passing reference to a lost Kairos by Polyclitus, on a base in the form of an astragalus (knucklebone-like die or dice), which stood near the entrance to the stadium.⁶⁵ Polyclitus worked in Ion's lifetime, and his Canon of bodily perfection and beauty—exemplified in his athlete sculptures—may owe some debt to Pythagorean mathematics.⁶⁶ Regarding Polyclitus' Pythagoreanism, opinion, as always, is divided, but in the 'hard', unmetaphorical reading of a cryptic Plutarchism, we find that perfection is achieved when many numbers, *polloi arithmoi*, come to a *kairos* (*De recta ratione audiendi*

⁵⁷ See Sutton (1989) 48.

⁵⁸ Note Lycophron 83A6 DK; cf. the "cosmic lyre" of Scythinus fr. 1 West; Burkert (1972) 356; West (1971a) 161 and (1983c) 30.

⁵⁹ Dover (1986) 30.

⁶⁰ Montiglio (2000) 32–3, with examples; Race (1981) 201.

⁶¹ Petit (1997) links *kairos* and Pythagorean silence (cf. Iambl. *VP* 257).

⁶² See Dover (1986) 30–1 on this echo of 31B129 DK: *καλῶν ἐπιτήρανε ἔργων* modelled on *σοφῶν ἐπιτήρανος ἔργων*; see Katsaros in this volume on 89 Leurini = 26 West.

⁶³ After Gregory (1997) 1.

⁶⁴ Note the link of *rhythmos* in music, athletics and sculpture: for example, Raschke (1988b) 6.

⁶⁵ Polyclitus' Kairos: cf. Sauer (1890–94) 898–9; Guarducci (1966) 291–2. Its absence from Olympia in Pausanias' time is not surprising given, for instance, Caligula's rape of the site (cf. Nero at Delphi: Paus. 10.7.1). Note Plin. *NH* 34.55 on Polyclitus' *nudus talo incessens*. Some suggest that the Westmacott Ephebe, whose feet evidently fit the markings on the Olympian astragalus, may be the lost Kairos: see LIMC s.v. Kairos, p. 924.

⁶⁶ Evidence for the Canon is summarized by Philipp (1990). On Polyclitus' Pythagoreanism see Raven (1951); Burkert (1972) 290n64; Stewart (1978a), who considers whether Polyclitus' *harmonia* "and thus his Canon, may not have been rooted, like Pythagoras's in the ratios of the musical scale" (p. 166n15); Stewart (1998) 273–5; Huffman (2002).

45c)⁶⁷—“the Midas touch of sculpture”.⁶⁸ The *kairos* may even be the Canon.⁶⁹

Certainly, in the next generation, Lysippus’ statue of Kairos has been regarded as his response to Polyclitus’ canonical statement on the perfect, kairotic statue. Lysippus’ work—a more perfect Kairos?—is the foundation of all literary and artistic personifications of Kairos ever since: Kairos’ scales, razor, long forelock and bald occiput are canonical in all later *temporal* ekphrases.⁷⁰

The dice—*astragaloi*—of Polyclitus’ Kairos have obvious numerical significance. Similarly, they evoke thoughts of Tyche (Fortune) with her obvious connection to Kairos: according to Plato’s Athenian Stranger, Kairos and Tyche co-operate in the control of all human affairs.⁷¹ *Tyche* has Pythagorean connections, and our Ion wrote, more than once, of *tyche*: it is one of *Triagmos*’ Big Three—Luck, Might, Intelligence.⁷²

⁶⁷ ὡς ἐν ἔργῳ γε παντὶ τὸ μὲν καλὸν ἐκ πολλῶν οἶον ἀριθμῶν εἰς ἓνα καιρὸν ἡκόντων ὑπὸ συμμετρίας τινὸς καὶ ἀρμονίας ἐπιτελεῖται, τὸ δ’ αἰσχροὺν ἐξ ἑνὸς τοῦ τυχόντος ἐλλείποντος ἢ προσόντος ἀτόπως εὐθὺς ἐτοιμὴν ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν..., “Now in every piece of work, beauty is achieved through the congruence of numerous factors, so to speak, brought into union under the rule of a certain due proportion and harmony, whereas ugliness is ready to spring into being if only a single chance element be omitted or added out of place” (tr. Babbitt). See Stewart (1978a) 165.

⁶⁸ Stewart (1978b) 301.

⁶⁹ Stewart (1978a) 165–6; (1978c) 126: “the rightness of a given work of art”.

⁷⁰ See Stewart (1978a); Bieber (1961) 38–9; Smith (1991) 66; LIMC s.v. Kairos 921, 924. This Kairos was destroyed in AD 462 in Byzantium. Literary relics of [Lysippus] Kairos survive in *Greek Anthology* epigrams: Palladas 10.52; Phanios 12.31; Posidippus 16.275 (“set up in the porch as a lesson”). Note Phaedrus 5.8: *occasionem rerum significat brevem*; Ausonius *Epigrammata* 33.10; Callistratus *Stat.* 6; Himerius *Ecl.* 14.1. In general, see Rüdiger (1966). The razor: note the Iliadic proverb “it stands on the razor’s edge” at 10.713. On *akme* (proverbial) see Race (1981) 212n42 on Aesch. *Pers.* 407 (*akme* as a point, watershed in time); Thgn. 555–60; on the semantic proximity of *akme* and *kairos* see Trédé (1992) 49–52. Both Lysippus and Polyclitus have connections with Sicyon (for example, Gardner 1896: 325)—we recall that the area of Olympia where we suggest the Kairos stood is close to the Sicyonian Treasury. Lysippus’ Kairos was set up in Pella, although there is also evidence for an installation at Sicyon.

⁷¹ Pl. *Laws* 709b. See Guarducci (1966); Trédé (1992) 218–21; Détéienne & Vernant (1978) 223–5; Race (1981) 212: “designating the circumstances within which it is possible or expedient to do something”. De Romilly (1968) 119 links time and *tyche*. See LIMC s.v. Tyche. Smith (1991) 66 suggests that Kairos’ lack of long-term popularity was “because the need he answered was subsumed in the worship of Tyche”. Both are crucial in navigation—Tyche is a sea-goddess in origin: Détéienne (1981b) 20–3.

⁷² Pythagorean *tyche*: Burkert (1972) 108. Ion’s *tyche*: 114 Leurini = 36B1 DK = Harpocr. s.v. Ion; Isoc. *Antid.* 268 (with *sunesis* and *kratos*). As Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1932) 302 noted, this is *not* a personification. Elsewhere, we find that *tyche* is “in many respects different from wisdom (*sophia*), but produces many of the same effects”: 118* Leurini = 36B3 DK = Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 316d; *Quaest. conv.* 717b. A suitably cynical

As Elsner expounds, “monuments as ideas or ideological constructs always have the added dimension of having been real things”.⁷³ My re-imagined topography re-installs all of these lost *Kairoi* in this kairotically significant corner of the Olympian landscape.⁷⁴ We are missing at least one vital piece of the puzzle,⁷⁵ but I suggest that the conceptual and topographic ensemble of the Altar to Kairos, the Polyclitan Kairos, the South Italian “Olympian Kairos”, the Hymn to Kairos—allied with the growing theoretical attention paid to *kairos*—point towards an intriguing “mode of Greek thought”⁷⁶ at work in the middle of the fifth century; and, moreover, something that is a deviation from the life of mainstream celebrity⁷⁷ that many assume Ion to have led. Faced with the “slipperiness”⁷⁸ of *kairos*, the enviable certainty with which Pausanias inserts

(sophistic?) statement for one who undertook to make concrete the flighty Kairos? Lesky (1966) 410 receives “the impression that Ion’s poetry, with its mastery of form, came mostly from the intellect”.

⁷³ Elsner (1994) 224–5.

⁷⁴ Alcock (1993) 172, 174: the sacred landscape is “culturally constructed and historically sensitive”; “spatial order” here can “articulate social order, and be linked with shifting relations of power and influence”.

⁷⁵ One might say that we have Opportunity but no motive: Webster (1954) 13 observes that abstractions are “deified at moments of great and compelling emotion”. In these terms, *kairos* as “critical moment” is curiously apt: Trédé (1992) 178–87. Cf. Webster, p. 14: personifications can respond to a significant event (and thus do not necessarily persist). The usual comparison offered is the erection of an altar to *Peme*—the personified Report or Rumour—after the news of Cimon’s Eurymedon victory (467) reached Athens on the same day (Schol. Aeschin. *In Tim.* 128–30). On Eurymedon and early personifications, see Smith (1999). *Peme*, of course, is already a god at *Works & Days* 763–4. Cf. Parker (1996) 233–4. Is there another Cimonian Theseus allusion in the link between *kairos* and navigation? Cimon (naval commander) links himself with Theseus (son of Poseidon): see Smith (1999) 131; Garland (1992) 84; the temenos at Velia produced three other *cippi* dedicated to navigation-related deities (Poseidon Asphaleios, Zeus Ourios and Pompaioi); Guarducci (1966); Leurini (1973). As Olding demonstrates in this volume, we ought not underestimate the subtlety with which Ion constructs his puzzles; nor the receptivity (and “poetic competence”—Garner 1990: 144–5) of his audience to this type of hermeneutical adventure. See Barron (1980) on Bacchylides’ “veiled” tribute to Cimon (he draws a connection between “horsy” Poseidon and the horse-loving Philaid family—on *kairos* and horses, see note 18 above); cf. Barron (1986) 93–4.

⁷⁶ Webster (1954).

⁷⁷ See Henderson in this volume on our inheritance of the lexicographers’ mainstream Ion (“he wrote lots...”). Celebrity: περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο in T8 Leurini = *FGrH* 392 T2 = Schol. Ar. *Pax* 835 and T11 Leurini = Suda δ 1029.

⁷⁸ Stewart (1978a) 171.

“*I know*” into his “scripted sacred landscape”⁷⁹ may be beyond our grasp: nevertheless, the gaps, the missing pieces of Ion, are as interesting and telling as those we actually possess, and these absences themselves offer a new way of looking at, or for, Ion of Chios.

⁷⁹ Antonaccio (1994) 101; cf. Cherry (2001) 250. Kairos had gained different semantic resonances again by Pausanias’ day; it was a significant concept in the Second Sophistic: Noël (1998) 237n17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbenes, J., Slings, S. R. and Sluiter, I. (eds.) (1995) *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*. Amsterdam
- Abel, D. H. (1943) "Genealogies of ethical concepts from Hesiod to Bacchylides", *TAPA* 74: 92–101
- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002) *Polyeideia. The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley and London
- Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge
- and Swain, S. C. R. (2002) "Introduction", in Adams, Janse and Swain (eds.), 1–20
- , Janse, M. and Swain, S. C. R. (eds.) (2002) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*. Oxford
- Adcock, F. E. (1927) "The breakdown of the Thirty Years Peace, 445–431 BC", in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5, 1st edn, 165–92. Cambridge
- and Mosley, D. J. (1975) *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*. London
- Adler, A. (1928–38) *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. Leipzig
- Ahl, F. (1984) "The art of safe criticism in Greece and Rome", *AJP* 105: 174–208
- Alcock, S. E. (1993) *Graeca Capta: The Landscape of Roman Greece*. Cambridge
- (1994) "Minding the gap in Hellenistic and Roman Greece", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 247–61
- (1996) "Landscapes of memory and the authority of Pausanias", in Bingen (ed.), 241–76
- and Osborne, R. (eds.) (1994) *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford
- , Cherry, J. F. and Elsner, J. (eds.) (2001) *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford
- Algra, K., Barnes, J., Mansfield, J. and Schofield, M. (eds.) (1999) *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge
- Allacci, L. (1642) *Leonis Allatii Hellas, in natales Delphini Gallici*. Rome
- Allan, A. (2005) "Situational aesthetics: the deification of Kairos, son of Hermes", in Stafford and Herrin (eds.), 123–134
- Allan, W. (2001) "Euripides in Megale Hellas: some aspects of the early reception of tragedy", *G&R* 48: 67–86
- Allègre, F. (1890) *De Ione Chio*. Paris
- Allen, T. W. (1912) *Homeri Opera*, vol. 5. Oxford
- , Halliday, W. R. and Sikes, E. E. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford
- Aloni, A. (2001) "The poem of Simonides' Plataea elegy and the circumstances of its performance", in Boedeker and Sider (eds.), 86–105
- Aly, W. (1929) "Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa", *Philologus Supplementband* 21: 69–104
- Amandry, P. (1947–48) "Chronique des fouilles en 1946: découvertes et acquisitions nouvelles", *BCH* 71–72: 385–402
- Ameling, W. (1996) "Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte", in Bingen (ed.), 117–66
- Andersen, Ø. (1977) "Odysseus and the Wooden Horse", *SO* 52: 5–18
- Anderson, M. J. (ed.) (1965) *Classical Drama and its Influence: Essays Presented to H. D. F. Kitto*. London
- Anderson, W. D. (1994) *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca and London
- Antonaccio, C. (1994) "Placing the past: the Bronze Age in the cultic topography of early Greece", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 79–104

- Appadurai, A. (1986b) "Introduction: commodities and the politics of value", in Appadurai (ed.) (1986a), 3–63
- (ed.) (1986a) *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge
- Arafat, K. (1992) "Pausanias' attitude to antiquities", *ABSA* 87: 387–409
- (1995) "Pausanias and the Temple of Hera at Olympia", *ABSA* 90: 461–73
- (1996) *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*. Cambridge
- Arnott, W. G. (2000) "On editing comic fragments from literary and lexicographical sources", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 1–13
- Austin, M. M. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1977) *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction*. Berkeley
- Avezzi, G. (1989) "Progetto e tecnica del meraviglioso: Ione di Chio e la spettacolarità", in Lanza and Longo (eds.), 153–62
- Ax, W. (ed.) (1990) *Memoria Rerum Veterum: Festschrift für Carl Joachim Classen zum 60. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart
- Babbitt, F. C. (1927) *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. 1 (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA and London
- Bacon, F. (1605) "The Advancement of Learning", in Vickers, B. (ed.) (1996) *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Oxford
- Badian, E. (1993) *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*. Baltimore and London
- Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin
- (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis
- Bakker, E. J., de Jong, I. J. F. and van Wees, H. (2002) (eds.) *Brill Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden, Boston and Köln
- Balcer, J. (1976) "Imperial magistrates in the Athenian Empire", *Historia* 25: 257–87
- Baltussen, H. (1999) Review of Burkert *et al.* (eds.) (1998), *BMCR* 99.9.23
- (2000) "Plato in the Placita (Aëtius bk. IV): a Dielsian blind spot", *Philologus* 144: 227–38
- (2002) "Theophrastean Echoes? Theophrastus' *De sensibus* in the Platonic and Aristotelian tradition (Alexander, Alcinous, Plotinus)", in Wöhrle and Fortenbaugh (eds.), 39–58
- Barber, G. L. (1935) *The Historian Ephorus*. Cambridge
- Barchiesi, A. (2001) "The crossing", in Harrison (ed.), 142–63
- Barker, A. (1978) "οἱ καλούμενοι ἁρμονικοί: the predecessors of Aristoxenus", *PCPS* 24: 1–21
- (1984) *Greek Musical Writings I. The Musician and His Art*. Cambridge
- (1988) "Che cos' era la magadis", in Gentili and Pretagostini (eds.), 96–107
- (1989) *Greek Musical Writings II. Harmonic and Acoustic Theory*. Cambridge
- Barnes, J. (1987) *Early Greek Philosophy*. Harmondsworth
- (ed.) (1984) *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, 2 vols. Princeton
- Barron, J. P. (1964) "Religious propaganda of the Delian League", *JHS* 84: 35–48
- (1980) "Bakchylides, Theseus and a woolly cloak", *BICS* 27: 1–8
- (1986) "Chios in the Athenian Empire", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 89–103
- Bartol, K. (2000) "Ion of Chios and the King (Ion, 27, 1–3 W. = 2, 1–3 G.-P.)", *Mnemosyne* 53: 185–92
- Bassett, S. E. (1931) "The place and date of the first performance of the *Persians* of Timotheus", *CP* 26: 153–65
- Bassi, K. (1995) "Male nudity and disguise in the discourse of Greek histrionics", *Helios* 22: 3–22
- Battisti, D. (1990) "*Sunetos* as aristocratic self-description", *GRBS* 31: 5–25
- Beazley, J. D. (1939) "Some Inscriptions on Vases, III", *AJA* 39: 475–88
- (1947) "The Rosi Krater", *JHS* 77: 1–9

- (1949) “A passage in Ion of Chios”, *CR* 63: 83
- (1956) *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters*. Oxford
- (1963) *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 3 vols, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Bélis, A. (1986) “La aulos phrygien”, *Revue Archéologique* n.s. 1: 21–40
- Benndorf, O. (1885) “Über eine Statue des Polyklet”, in *Gesammelte Studien zue Kunstgeschichte: Eine Festgabe zum 4. Mai 1885 für Anton Springer*, 1–11. Leipzig
- Bentley, R. (1962) *Epistola ad Joannem Millium*. Toronto (originally published 1691)
- Bérard, C. et al. (eds.) (1989) *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*. Princeton (French original 1984)
- Bergk, Th. (1834) “De carmine Solonis ad Mimnermum”, *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 1.53: 428–9
- Bergren, A. (1981) “Helen’s ‘good drug’, *Odyssey* iv, 1–305”, in Kresic (ed.), 201–14
- Berlin, I. (1953) *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy’s View of History*. London
- Bernadini Marzolla, P. (1982) “Ione di Chio apud Ateneo XIII 604b”, *Maia* 34: 13–9
- Berti, F. and Restani, D. (1989) *Lo specchio della musica*. Rome
- Bieber, M. (1961) *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, 2nd edn. New York
- Bingen, J. (ed.) (1996) *Pausanias historien. Huit exposés suivis de discussion* (Entretiens Hardt sur l’antiquité classique 41). Geneva
- Birge, D. (1994) “Trees in the landscape of Pausanias’ *Periegesis*”, in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 231–45
- Blakolmer, F. (2000) “Zum Charakter der frühagäischen Farben: Linear B und Homer”, *Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie* 3: 225–39
- Blanshard, A. J. L. (2004) “Depicting democracy: an exploration of art and text in the law of Eukrates”, *JHS* 124: 1–15
- Blass, F. (1887) *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 4 vols. Leipzig
- Blösel, W. (2001) “The Herodotean picture of Themistocles: a mirror of fifth-century Athens”, in Luraghi (ed.), 179–97
- Bluck, R. S. (1958) “Plato, Pindar and metempsychosis”, *AJP* 79: 405–14
- Blum, R. (1991) *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Wisconsin
- Blumenthal, A. von (1939) *Ion von Chios: die Reste seiner Werke*. Stuttgart
- Boardman, J. (1967) *Excavations in Chios, 1952–1955: Greek Emporio*. London
- (1970) *Greek Gems and Finger Rings*. London
- (1975) “Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis”, *JHS* 95: 1–12
- (1986) “Archaic Chian pottery at Naucratis”, in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 251–8
- (1994) “Omphale”, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, vol. 7.1, 45–53. Zürich
- and Kurtz, D. (1971) *Greek Burial Customs*. London
- and Vaphopoulou-Richardson, C. E. (eds.) (1986) *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984*. Oxford
- Boedeker, D. (2002) “Epic heritage and mythical patterns in Herodotus”, in Bakker, de Jong and van Wees (eds.), 97–116
- and Raaflaub, K. A. (eds.) (1998) *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge MA
- and Sider, D. (eds.) (2001) *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford
- Böhr, E. and Martini, W. (eds.) (1985) *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei. Konrad Schauenburg zum 65.* Mainz
- Bömer, F. (1957–58) *P. Ovidii Nasonis, Die Fasten*, 2 vols. Heidelberg
- Borries, J. de (1911) *Praeparatio sophistica*. Leipzig
- Bosworth, B. (1993) “The humanitarian aspect of the Melian dialogue”, *JHS* 113: 30–44
- Bousquet, J. (1966) “Inscriptions de Delphes”, *BCH* 90: 429–46

- Bowie, A. M. (1997) "Thinking with drinking: wine and the symposium in Aristophanes", *JHS* 117: 1–21
- Bowie, E. (1974) "Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic", in Finley (ed.), 166–209
- (1986) "Early Greek elegy, symposium and public festival", *JHS* 106: 13–35
- (1995) "Wine in Old Comedy", in Murray and Tecusan (eds.), 113–25
- (1996) "Past and present in Pausanias", in Bingen (ed.), 207–39
- (2001a) "Ancestors of historiography in early Greek elegiac and iambic poetry?", in Luraghi (ed.), 45–66
- (2001b) "Inspiration and aspiration: date, genre, and readership", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 21–32
- Bowra, C. M. (1940a) "Sophocles on his own development", *AJP* 61: 385–401
- (1940b) "The fox and the hedgehog", *CQ* 34: 26–9
- (1966) "A Cretan hymn", in Kelly (ed.), 31–46
- Boyd, T. W. (1993) "Recognising Helen", *Illinois Classical Studies* 23: 1–18
- Boys-Stones, G. R. (ed.) (2003) *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*. Oxford
- Bradley, E. M. (1967) "Hector and the simile of the snowy mountain", *TAPA* 98: 37–41
- Branham, R. B. (ed.) (2002) *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Evanston
- Braund, D. and Wilkins, J. (eds.) (2002) *Athenaeus and his World*. Exeter
- Braund, D. C. (1993) "Dionysiac tragedy in Plutarch, *Crassus*", *CQ* 43: 468–74
- Bremer, J. M. (1981) "Greek hymns", in Versnel (ed.), 193–215
- (1995) "Menander Rhetor on hymns", in Abbenes, Slings and Sluiter (eds.), 259–275
- (1998) "Greek cultic poetry: some ideas behind a forthcoming edition", *Mnemosyne* 51: 513–24
- Bremmer, J. (1990) "Adolescents, *symposion*, and pederasty", in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 135–48
- Brijder, H. A. G., Drukker, A. A. and Neeft, C. W. (eds.) (1986) *Enthousiasmos. Essays on Greek and Related Pottery Presented to J. M. Hemelrijk*. Amsterdam
- Brisson, L. (2000) "Notices: I.20, Ion de Chios", in Goulet, R. (ed.) *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol. 3, 864–6. Paris
- Brown, A. L. (1996) "Ion of Chios", in Hornblower and Spawforth (eds.), 763–4
- Brown, N. O. (1947) *Hermes the Thief: The Evolution of a Myth*. Madison
- Bruce, I. A. F. (1964) "Chios and *PSI* 1304", *Phoenix* 18: 272–82
- Buchholz, E. (1880) *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen für den Schul- und Privatgebrauch erklärt und mit litterarhistorischen Einleitungen versehen. I: Die Elegiker und Jambographen enthaltend*, 3rd edn. Leipzig
- (1886) *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen für den Schul- und Privatgebrauch erklärt und mit litterarhistorischen Einleitungen versehen. I: Die Elegiker und Iambographen enthaltend*, 4th edn. Leipzig
- Buck, C. D. (1933) *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago
- (1955) *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago
- Bühler, W. (1982–) *Zenobii Aethi proverbialia*, 5 vols. Göttingen
- Bultrighini, U. (1999) *Maledetta democrazia: studi su Crizia*. Alessandria
- Burkert, W. (1968) "Orpheus and die Vorsokratiker. Bemerkungen zum Derveni-Papyrus und zur pythagoreischen Zahlenlehre", *A&A* 88: 159–77
- (1972) *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Cambridge MA (German original 1962)
- (1987) "The making of Homer in the sixth century BC: rhapsodes versus Stesichorus", in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World*. Malibu, 43–62
- (1999) "Diels' Vorsokratiker", in Calder and Mansfeld (eds.), 169–206
- , Gemelli, L., Matelli, E. and Orelli, L. (eds.) (1998) *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike* (Aporemata 3). Göttingen
- Burn, L. (1987) *The Meidias Painter*. Oxford

- Burnet, J. (1911) *Plato's Phaedo*. Oxford
- (1945) *Early Greek Philosophy*, 4th edn. London
- Burridge, R. A. (2004) *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd edn. Michigan and Cambridge
- Burton, G. (1996–) “Kairos”, *Silva Rhetoricae*. <http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/>
- Bury, J. B. (1952) *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, 3rd edn. London
- Bury, R. G. (1926) *Plato: Laws* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 2. London and Cambridge MA
- (1932) *Plato: Symposium*. Cambridge
- Buxton, R. (1994) *Imaginary Greece. The Contexts of Mythology*, Cambridge
- (1995) *Sophocles* (G&R New Surveys in the Classics 16). Oxford
- (ed.) (1999) *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*. Oxford
- Bywater, I. (1984) “Poetics”, in Barnes (ed.), 2.2316–40
- Calame, C. (1995) *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca and London (French original 1986)
- Calder, W. M. (1961) “Socrates at Amphipolis (*Ap.* 28e)”, *Phronesis* 6: 83–5
- and Mansfeld, J. (eds.) (1999) *Hermann Diels (1848–1922) et la Science de l'Antiquité* (Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique 45). Geneva
- Calhoun, G. M. (1913) *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation*. New York
- Cameron, A. (1993) *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford
- Campbell, D. A. (1984) “Stobaeus and early Greek lyric poetry”, in Gerber (ed.), 51–7
- (1992) *Greek Lyric IV: Bacchylides, Corinna and Others* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA and London
- (1993) *Greek Lyric V: The New School of Poetry and Anonymous Songs and Hymns* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA and London
- Carden, R. (1974) *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* (Texte und Kommentare 7). Berlin and New York
- Carlyle, T. (1840) “On History”, in *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. 2, 378–93. London
- (1846) *On Heroes, Hero-worship, and the Heroic in History*, 3rd edn. London
- Carpenter, T. H. (1986) *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Art*. Oxford
- (1991) *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*. London
- and Faraone, C. (eds.) *Masks of Dionysus*. Ithaca
- Carratelli, G. P. (1970) “OLYMPIOS KAIROS”, *PP* 25: 248–9
- Cartledge, P. A. (1978) “Literacy in the Spartan Oligarchy”, *JHS* 98: 25–37
- (1979) *Sparta and Lakonia. A Regional History 1300–362 BC*. London
- (1987) *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*. Baltimore
- Millett, P. and Todd, S. (eds.) (1990) *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*. Cambridge
- , Millett, P. and von Reden, S. (eds.) (1998) *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Cary, M. et al. (eds.) (1949) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1st edn. Oxford
- Casevitz, M. (1985) *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω-οἰκίζω* (Collection études et commentaires 97). Paris
- Cassio, A. C. and Cerri, G. (eds.) (1991) *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico*. Rome
- , Musti, D. and Rossi, L. (eds.) (2000) *Synaulia. Cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti Mediterranei*. Naples
- Cavell, S. (1994) *A Pitch of Philosophy: Autobiographical Exercises*. Cambridge MA
- Cawkwell, G. L. (1973) “The foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy”, *CQ* 23: 47–60
- Centanni, M. (1997) *Atene Assoluta. Crizia dalla Tragedia alla Storia*. Padova
- Cerri, G. (1977) “La *Ktisis* di Ione de Chio: prosa o versi?”, *QUCC* 26: 127–31

- Chailley, J. (1979) *La Musique grecque antique*. Paris
- Chamoux, F. (1996) "La méthode historique de Pausanias d'après le livre I de la *Periégèse*", in Bingen (ed.), 45–77
- Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris
- Cherry, J. F. (2001) "Travel, nostalgia, and Pausanias's *Giant*", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 247–55
- Cisne, J. L. (2005) "How science survived: medieval manuscripts' 'demography' and classic texts' extinction", *Science* 307 (no. 5713): 1305–7
- Clarke, K. (2005) "Parochial tales in a global empire: creating and recreating the world of the itinerant historian", in Troiani and Zecchini (eds.), 111–28
- Clarke, M. (1997) "Gods and mountains in Greek mythological poetry", in Lloyd (ed.), 65–80
- (1999) *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer*. Oxford
- (2001) "'Heart-cutting talk': Homeric κερτομέω and related words", *CQ* 51: 329–38
- (2004) "The semantics of colour in the early Greek word-hoard", in Cleland and Stears (eds.), 131–9
- , Currie, B. and †Lyne, R. O. A. M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions. Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*. Oxford
- Clay, J. S. (1989) *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton
- Clayman, D. (1980) *Callimachus' Iambi* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 59). Leiden
- Cleland, L. and Stears, K. (eds.) (2004) *Colour in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Oxford
- Clement, P. A. and Hofferleit, H. B. (1969) *Plutarch's Moralia* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 8. Cambridge MA
- Cobet, C. G. (1860) "Miscellanea philologica et critica. III. Ad Stobaei Florilegium", *Mnemosyne* 9: 113–48
- Cohen, A. (2001) "Art, myth, and travel in the Hellenistic world", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 93–126
- Cole, S. G. (1994) "Demeter in the ancient Greek city and its countryside", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 199–216
- Collard, C. (1991) *Euripides: Hecuba*. Warminster
- , Cropp, M. J. and Lee, K. H. (1995) *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. 1. Warminster
- Comotti, G. (1972) "L'endecacordo di Ione di Chio", *QUCC* 13: 54–61
- Connolly, A. (1998) "Was Sophocles heroised as Dexion?", *JHS* 118: 1–21
- Connor, W. R. (1970) "Theseus in classical Athens", in Ward (ed.), 143–74
- (1996) "Theseus and his city", in Hellström and Alroth (eds.), 115–20
- Contoléon, N. M. (1947–48) "Monuments à décoration gravée du musée de Chios", *BCH* 71–72: 273–301
- Contoléon, N. M. (1949) "Inscriptions de Chios", *Rev. Phil.* 23 (ser. 3): 5–16, pls. 1–3
- Cook, A. B. (1914) *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. 1. Cambridge
- (1925a) *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. 2.2. Cambridge
- (1925b) "Appendix A. Kairos", in Cook (1925a), 859–68
- (1940) *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vols. 3.1 and 3.2. Cambridge
- Cooley, A. (ed.) (2000) *The Afterlife of Inscriptions: Reusing, Rediscovering, Reinventing and Revitalizing Ancient Inscriptions* (BICS Supplement 75). London
- Coulson, W. and Kyrieleis, H. (eds.) (1992) *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games, 5–9 September 1988*. Athens
- Coxon, A. H. (1986) *The Fragments of Parmenides* (Phronesis Suppl. 3). Assen
- Cramer, J. A. (1839) *Anecdota Graeca e Codd. Manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, 4 vols. Oxford

- Cribiore, R. (1996) *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36). Atlanta
- Crystal, D. (2000) *Language Death*. Cambridge
- Csapo, E. (2004) "The politics of New Music", in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 207–48
- and Miller, M. (1998) "Democracy, empire and art: towards a politics of time and narrative", in Boedeker and Raaflaub (eds.), 87–125
- and Miller, M. (eds.) (2003) *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honour of William J. Slater*. Oxford
- Curd, P. (1998) *The Legacy of Parmenides. Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*. Princeton
- Curtius, E. (1876) "Die Darstellungen des Kairos", *Archäologische Zeitung* 33: 1–8
- Dabrowa, E. (ed.) (1998) *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World: Proceedings of an International Conference in Honour of Professor Józef Wolski Held at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in September 1996* (Electrum: Studies in Ancient History 2). Krakow
- Dähnhardt, O. (1894) *Scholia in Aeschyli Persas*. Leipzig
- Dalby, A. (2000) "*Topikos oinos*: the named wines of Old Comedy", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 397–405
- Davidson, J. (2000) "Gnesippos *paigniagraphos*: the comic poets and erotic mime", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 41–66
- Davidson, J. F. (1988) "Homer and Sophocles' *Electra*", *BICS* 35: 45–72
- Davies, J. K. (1971) *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 BC*. Oxford
- (1978) *Democracy and Classical Greece*. Glasgow
- Davies, M. (1988) *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen
- (1991) *Sophocles: Trachiniae*. Oxford
- Davison, J. A. (1958) "Notes on the Panathenaia", *JHS* 78: 23–41
- Dawe, K. (2001) "People, objects, meaning: recent work on the study and collection of musical instruments", *The Galpin Society Journal* 54: 219–32
- Dawson, C. M. (1950) "The *Iambi* of Callimachus. A Hellenistic poet's experimental laboratory", *JCS* 1: 1–168
- Dawson, D. (1992) *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley and Oxford
- Decleva Caizzi, F. (1999) "Protagoras and Antiphon: sophistic debates on justice", in Long (ed.), 311–331
- Defradas, J. (1971) "Sur l'interprétation de la deuxième *Olympique* de Pindare", *REG* 84: 131–43
- Demand, N. (1975) "Pindar's *Olympian* 2, Theron's faith, and Empedocles' *Katharmoi*", *GRBS* 16: 347–57
- Denyer, N. (2001) *Plato: Alcibiades*. Cambridge
- Depew, M. (2000) "Enacted and represented dedications: genre and Greek hymn", in Depew and Obbink (eds.), 59–79
- and Obbink, D. (eds.) (2000) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge MA
- Derrida, J. (1981) *Dissemination*. London (French original 1972)
- (1987) *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. Chicago and London (French original 1980)
- Détienne, M. (1981a) *L'invention de la mythologie*. Paris
- (1981b) "The 'Sea-Crow'", in Gordon (ed.), 16–42 and 233–9
- (1996) *The Masters of Truth*. New York (French original 1967)
- and Vernant, J.-P. (1978) *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Sussex and New Jersey (French original 1974)
- DeVoto, J. G. (1995) *Claudius Aelianus ΠΟΙΚΙΛΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ (Varia Historia)*. Chicago
- Di Giglio, A. (1997) "Pappo Alessandrino musicologo e organologo?", *Kleos* 2: 99–104

- Diehl, E. (1916) "Ion von Chios", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 9, 1861–8. Stuttgart
- Diels, H. (1879) *Doxographi Graeci*. Berlin and Leipzig
- (1882) *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 9). Berlin
- and Kranz, W. (1951) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vols, 6th edn. Dublin and Zürich
- Dietrich, B. C. (1986) *Tradition in Greek Religion*. Berlin and New York
- Diggle, J. (1984) *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 1. Oxford
- Diller, A. (1975) *The Textual Tradition of Strabo's Geography. With Appendix: The Manuscripts of Eustathius' Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes*. Amsterdam
- Dindorf, G. (1824) *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon cum annotationibus interpretum*, 5 vols. Leipzig
- (1851) *Aeschylus tragoedia superstites et deperditorum fragmenta. Tomus III: Scholia graeca ex codibus aucta et emendata*. Oxford
- (1853) *Harpocratonis Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos*. Oxford
- Dinsmoor, W. B. (1950) *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 3rd edn. London
- Dittenberger, W. (1915–24) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols, 3rd edn. Leipzig
- Dodds, E. R. (1960) *Euripides: Bacchae*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Doherty, L. E. (1995) *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences, and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor
- Dorandi, T. (1991) "Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut: Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den antiken Schriftstellern", *ZPE* 87: 11–33
- (1992) "Il quarto libro delle 'Vite' di Diogene Laerzio: l'Academia da Speusippo a Clitomaco", *ANRW* 2.36.5: 3761–92
- Dougherty, C. (1993) *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. New York and Oxford
- (1994) "Archaic Greek foundation poetry: questions of genre and occasion", *JHS* 114: 35–46
- (2003) "Towards an itinerary of culture in fifth-century Athens", *Parallax* 9: 8–17
- and Kurke, L. (2003b) "Introduction: the cultures within Greek culture", in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.) (2003a), 1–16
- and Kurke, L. (eds.) (2003a) *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge
- Dover, K. J. (1980) *Plato: Symposium*. Cambridge
- (1986) "Ion of Chios: his place in the history of Greek literature", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 27–37. Reprinted in Dover (1988), 1–12
- (1988) *The Greeks and their Legacy: Collected Papers*, vol. 2. Oxford
- (1993) *Aristophanes' Frogs*. Oxford
- (1994) *Marginal Comment*. London
- (2000) "Foreword: Frogments", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 397–405
- Dübner, Fr. (1883) *Scholia graeca in Aristophanem cum prolegomenis grammaticorum, varietate lectionis optimorum codicum integra, ceterorum selecta, annotatione criticorum item selecta, cui sua quaedam inseruit*. Paris
- Dubrow, H. (1982) *Genre*. London
- Duff, T. E. (1999) *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford
- Dunbar, N. V. (1995) *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford
- Duncan, T. S. (1939) "The Memoirs of Ion of Chios", *TAPA* 70: 125–38
- Düring, I. (1945) "Studies in musical terminology in fifth-century literature", *Eranos* 43: 176–97
- Dusanic, S. (1999) "Isocrates, the Chian intellectuals, and the political context of the *Euthydemus*", *JHS* 119: 1–6
- Duse, U. (1980) "La lira di Ione di Chio", *QUCC* 33: 113–23
- Easterling, P. E. (1982) *Sophocles: Trachiniae*. Cambridge
- (1984) "The tragic Homer", *BICS* 31: 1–8

- (1985) “Greek poetry and Greek religion”, in Easterling and Muir (eds.), 34–49
- (1993) “The end of an era?”, in Sommerstein (ed.), 559–69
- (1997b) “From repertoire to canon”, in Easterling (ed.) (1997a), 211–27
- (2002) “A taste for the classics”, in Wiseman (ed.) (2002a), 21–37
- (ed.) (1997a) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge
- Easterling, P. E. and Knox, B. M. W. (eds.) (1985) *Cambridge History of Classical Literature. I: Greek Literature*. Cambridge
- and Muir, J. V. (eds.) (1985) *Greek Religion and Society*. Cambridge
- Eder, W. (ed.) (1995) *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendungen oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* Stuttgart
- Edmonds, J. M. (1922–27) *Lyra Graeca: Being the Remains of All the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus Excepting Pindar* (Loeb Classical Library), 3 vols. London
- (1931) *Elegy and Iambus: Being the Remains of all the Greek Elegaic and Iambic poets from Callinus to Crates Excepting the Choliambic Writers with the Anacreonta* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 1. Cambridge MA and London
- (1957–61) *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, 3 vols. Leiden
- Edmunds, L. (1985) “The genre of Theognidean poetry”, in Figueira and Nagy (eds.), 82–95
- (1997) “The seal of Theognis”, in Edmunds and Wallace (eds.), 29–48
- and Wallace, R. W. (eds.) (1997) *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore and London
- Edwards, M. and Reid, C. (eds.) (2004) *Oratory in Action*. Manchester and New York
- Edwards, M. J. (1997) “Epilogue: biography and the biographic”, in Edwards and Swain (eds.), 227–34
- and Swain, S. (eds.) (1997) *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Oxford
- Edwards, V. and Sienkewicz, T. J. (1990) *Oral Cultures Past and Present: Rappin’ and Homer*. Oxford
- Ehlers, W. W. (ed.) (1998) *La biographie antique* (Entretiens Hardt sur l’antiquité classique 44). Geneva
- Ehrenberg, V. (1951) *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- (1954) *Sophocles and Pericles*. Oxford
- Elsner, J. (1992) “Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim in the Roman world”, *P&P* 135: 3–29
- (1994) “From the pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: monuments, travel and writing”, in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 224–54
- (1995) “Viewing and identity: the travels of Pausanias; or, a Greek pilgrim in the Roman world”, in *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge, 125–55
- (2000) “Between mimesis and divine power: visuality in the Greco-Roman world”, in Nelson (ed.), 45–69
- (2001a) “Structuring ‘Greece’: Pausanias’s *Periegesis* as a literary construct”, in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 3–20
- (2001b) “Describing Self in the language of the Other: Pseudo (?) Lucian at the temple of Hierapolis”, in Goldhill (ed.) (2001a), 123–53
- Emerson, R. W. (1841) “History”, in *Selected Essays*, 149–73. Reprinted 1982 Harmondsworth
- Erbse, H. (1950) *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin
- Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. van (1990) *Reader and Spectator: Problems in the Interpretation of Greek Tragedy*. Amsterdam
- Etienne, R. (1992) “Autels et sacrifices”, in Schachter and Bingen (eds.), 291–319
- Euben, J. P. (1997) *Corrupting Youth: Political Education, Democratic Culture, and Political Theory*. Princeton
- Faerber, H. (1940a) “Μέλος”, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 60: 668–9

- (1940b) Review of von Blumenthal (1939), *Philologische Wochenschrift* 60: 193–201
- Fafalios, M. S. (1990) *Tales and Legends from Chios*. Athens
- Fairweather, J. (1974) “Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers”, *Ancient Society* 5: 231–75
- Fantham, E. (1983) “Sexual comedy in Ovid’s *Fasti*: sources and motivations”, *HSCP* 87: 185–216
- Farina, A. (1961) *Senofane di Colofone. Ione di Chio: Introduzione, Testo Critico, Testimonianze, Traduzione, Commento* (Collana di Studi Greci 34). Naples
- Farnell, L. R. (1909) *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. 5. Oxford
- Ferguson, J. (1980) *Callimachus*. Boston
- Ferretto, C. (1985) “Enopio fra mito e propaganda”, *Civiltà classica e cristiana* 6: 155–9
- Figueira, T. J. and Nagy, G. (eds.) (1985) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore
- Finley, J. H. (1938) “Euripides and Thucydides”, *HSCP* 49: 23–68
- (1939) “The origins of Thucydides’ style”, *HSCP* 50: 35–84
- Finley, M. I. (1978) “The fifth-century Athenian Empire: a balance-sheet”, in Garnsey and Whittaker (eds.), 103–26
- (1985) *The Ancient Economy*. London
- (ed.) (1974) *Studies in Ancient Society*. London
- Fischer, E. (1974) *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 1). Berlin and New York
- Fisher, N. (1989) “Drink, *hybris* and the promotion of harmony in Sparta”, in Powell (ed.), 26–50
- (1990) “The law of *hubris* in Athens”, in Cartledge, Millett and Todd (eds.), 123–138
- (2000) “Symposiasts, fish-eaters and flatterers: social mobility and moral concerns”, in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 355–96
- Flacelière, R. and Chambry, E. (1961) *Plutarque Vies VII. Cimon-Lucullus. Nicias-Crassus*. Paris
- Flashar, H. and Gaiser, K. (1965) (eds.) *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt zum 15. März 1965*. Pfullingen
- Flensted-Jensen, P., Nielson, T. H. and Rubinstein, L. (eds.) (2000) *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*. Copenhagen
- Flores, E. (1991) *Synesis. Studi su forme del pensiero storico e politico Greco e romano*. Napoli
- Flower, M. (2000) “From Simonides to Isocrates: the fifth-century origins of fourth-century Panhellenism”, *Classical Antiquity* 19: 65–101
- Ford, A. (1999) “Reading Homer from the rostrum: poems and laws in Aeschines’ *Against Timarchus*”, in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 231–56
- (2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton
- Fornara, C. W. and Samons, L. J. (1991) *Athens from Cleisthenes to Pericles*. Berkeley
- Forrest, W. G. (1960a) “The tribal organisation of Chios”, *ABSA* 55: 172–89
- (1960b) “Themistokles and Argos”, *CQ* 10: 238
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. and Gutas, D. (eds.) (1992) *Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific Writings*. New Brunswick and London
- Fowler, A. (1991) *Kinds of Literature: an Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford
- Fowler, H. N. (1936) *Plutarch’s Moralia* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 10. Cambridge MA
- and Lamb, W. R. M. (1925) *Plato VIII: The Statesman, Philebus, Ion* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA and London
- Fowler, R. L. (1996) “Herodotos and his contemporaries”, *JHS* 116: 62–77

- (2000) *Early Greek Mythography I: Texts*. Oxford
- (2001) "Early *historie* and literacy", in Luraghi (ed.), 95–115
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds.) (1998) *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-representation in the Classical Tradition*. London and New York
- Fraenkel, E. (1918a) "Lyrische Daktylen", *RhM* 72: 161–97
- (1918b) "Lyrische Daktylen", *RhM* 72: 321–52
- (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, 3 vols. Oxford
- Fränkel, H. (1975) *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. A History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth Century*. Oxford
- Frazer, J. G. (1898) *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 6 vols. London
- Freeman, K. (1948) *Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers. A Complete Translation of the Fragments in Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Oxford
- (1949) *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- French, A. (1971) *The Athenian Half-Century 478–431 BC. Thucydides i 89–118: Translation and Commentary*. Sydney
- Friedländer, P. and Hoffleit, H. B. (1948) *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Friedrich, R. (1996) "Everything to do with Dionysos? Ritualism, the Dionysiac, and the tragic", in Silk (ed.), 257–83
- Frisch, H. (1942) *The Constitution of the Athenians: A Philological-historical Analysis of Pseudo-Xenophon's Treatise De Republica Athenensium* (Classica et Mediaevalia Dissertations 2). Copenhagen
- Frisk, H. (1960–72) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols. Heidelberg
- Fritz, K. von (1957) "ἑστρις ἐκατέρωθι in Pindar's 2nd *Olympian* and Pythagoras' theory of metempsychosis", *Phronesis* 2: 85–9
- (1967) *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, 2 vols. Berlin
- Froning, H. (1971) *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen*. Würzburg
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1989) "In the mirror of the mask", in Bérard *et al.* (eds.), 151–65
- Fuchs, W. (1986) "The Chian element in Chian art", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 275–93
- Fuks, A. (1968) "Slave war and slave troubles in Chios in the third century BC", *Athenaeum* 46: 102–11
- Furley, W. D. (1993) "Types of Greek hymns", *Eos* 81: 21–41
- (1995) "Praise and persuasion in Greek Hymns", *JHS* 115: 29–46
- and Bremer, J. M. (eds.) (2001) *Greek Hymns*, 2 vols. Tübingen
- Fyfe, W. H. and Russell, D. (1995) "Longinus *On the Sublime*", in *Aristotle XXIII* (Loeb Classical Library), 2nd edn, 143–307. Cambridge MA and London
- Gagarin, M. and Woodruff, P. (1995) *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists*. Cambridge
- Gaisford, T. (1834) *Suidae Lexicon*. Oxford
- (1848) *Etymologicon Magnum seu verius Lexicon saepissime vocabulorum origines indagans ex pluribus lexicis scholiastis et grammaticis anonymi cuiusdam opera concinnatum*. Oxford
- Gallavotti, C. (1957) "Nomi dei colori in miceneo", *PP* 19: 5–22
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, 2 vols. Baltimore and London
- Gardiner, E. N. (1925) *Olympia: Its History and Remains*. Oxford
- Gardner, E. A. (1896) *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture*. London
- Garland, R. (1992) *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London
- Garner, R. (1990) *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London and New York
- Garnsey, P. D. A. and Whittaker, C. R. (eds.) (1978) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. Cambridge

- Garofalo, I. (1996) "Una nuova testimonianza su Ione di Chio", *Filologia antica e moderna* 10: 97–9
- Gauly, B. et al. (eds.) (1991) "Ion", in *Musa tragica: Die griechische Tragödie von Thespis bis Ezechiel. Ausgewählte Zeugnisse und Fragmente griechisch und deutsch* (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft 16). Göttingen, 64–81
- Gebhard, E. (1993) "The evolution of a pan-Hellenic sanctuary: from archaeology towards history at Isthmia", in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 154–77
- Gehrke, H.-J. (1985) *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* München
- Geiger, J. (1985) *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography* (Historia Einzelschriften 47). Stuttgart
- Gentili, B. (1988) *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece from Homer to the Fifth Century*. Baltimore (Italian original 1985)
- and Cerri, G. (1983) *Storia e biografia nel pensiero antico*. Rome
- and Cerri, G. (1988) *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*. Amsterdam
- and Prato, C. (1979) *Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta*, vol. 1. Leipzig
- and Prato, C. (1985) *Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta*, vol. 2. Leipzig
- and Pretagostini, R. (eds.) (1988) *La Musica in Grecia*. Rome
- Gerber, D. E. (1962) "What time can do (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.46–47)", *TAPA* 93: 30–3
- (1988) "The measure of Bacchus: Euenus fr. 2. West, Gent.-Pr. = *Anth. Pal.* 11.49", *Mnemosyne* 41: 39–45
- (1999a) *Greek Iambic Poetry from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA
- (1999b) *Greek Elegiac Poetry from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA
- (ed.) (1984) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*. Chico CA
- Giannantoni, G. (1992) "Il secondo libro delle 'Vite' di Diogene Laerzio", *ANRW* 2.36.5: 3603–18
- Gilman, S. L. and Glaze, F. E. (2005) "'How science survived'—medieval manuscripts as fossils", *Science* 307 (no. 5713): 1208–9
- Glass, S. L. (1988) "The Greek gymnasium: some problems", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 155–73
- Goetz, G. and Schoell, F. (1910) *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina quae supersunt*. Leipzig
- Goldhill, S. (1990) "The Great Dionysia and civic ideology", in Winkler and Zeitlin (eds.), 97–129
- (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge
- (1998) "Reading differences: the *Odyssey* and juxtaposition", *Ramus* 17: 1–31
- (2001b) "Introduction. Setting an agenda: 'Everything is Greece to the wise'", in Goldhill (ed.) (2001a), 1–25
- (2001c) "The erotic eye: visual stimulation and cultural conflict", in Goldhill (ed.) (2001a), 154–94
- (2002a) "Becoming Greek, with Lucian", in *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*, 60–107. Cambridge
- (2002b) *The Invention of Prose* (*G&R New Surveys in the Classics* 32). Oxford
- (ed.) (2001a) *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge
- and Osborne, R. (eds.) (1994) *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge
- and Osborne, R. (eds.) (1999) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge
- Gomme, A. W. (1945) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1. Oxford
- Gomperz, T. (1866) *Philodem über Frömmigkeit*. Leipzig
- Gordon, R. L. (ed.) (1981) *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist Essays by M. Détienné, L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet*. Cambridge and Paris

- Görgemanns, H. (1976) "Rhetorik und Poetik im homerischen Hermeshymnus", in Görgemanns and Schmidt (eds.), 113–128
- and Schmidt, E. A. (eds.) (1976) *Studien zum antiken Epos*. Meisenheim am Glan
- Gostoli, A. (1990) *Terpander* (Lyricorum graecorum quae exstant 8). Rome
- Gottschalk, H. B. (1980) *Heraclides of Pontus*. Oxford
- Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus*. London
- Gould, T. (1990) *The Ancient Quarrel between Poetry and Philosophy*. Princeton
- Graf, F. (1993) "Dionysian and Orphic eschatology: new texts and old questions", in Carpenter and Faraone (eds.), 239–58
- Gray, V. J. (1995) "Xenophon's Image of Socrates in the *Memorabilia*", *Prudentia* 27.2: 50–73
- (1998) *The Framing of Socrates. The Literary Interpretation of Xenophon's Memorabilia*. Stuttgart
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: the Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge
- Green, J. R. (1991) "On seeing and depicting the theatre in classical Athens", *GRBS* 32: 15–52
- (1994) *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*. London and New York
- Greene, G. C. (1938) *Scholia Platonica* (APA Monographs 8). Haverford, PA
- Gregory, E. (1997) *H.D. and Hellenism: Classic Lines*. Cambridge
- Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. (1919) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII*. London
- Gribble, D. (1999) *Alcibiades and Athens: A Study in Literary Presentation*. Oxford
- Griffin, J. (1990) "Die Ursprünge der Historien Herodots", in Ax (ed.), 51–82
- (1998) "The social function of Attic tragedy", *CQ* 48: 39–61
- Griffith, J. G. (1988) "Who wrote the epigram for the Athenians who fell at the battle of Coronea? (IG I³, 1163; IG I², 942)", in *Festinat Senex or An Old Man in a Hurry, Being an Assortment of Unpublished Essays on Problems in Greek and Latin Literature and Archaeology Together with Reprints of Three Articles*. Oxford, 24–30
- Griffith, M. (1995) "Brilliant dynasts: power and politics in the *Oresteia*", *Classical Antiquity* 14: 62–129
- Guarducci, M. (1966) "Divinità fauste nell'antica Velia", *PP* 21: 279–94
- Guillamaud, P. (1988) "L'essence du kairos", *REA* 90: 359–71
- Gulick, C. B. (1927–41) *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists* (Loeb Classical Library), 7 vols. Cambridge MA
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1939) *Aristotle On the Heavens* (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge MA
- (1952) *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, 2nd edn. London
- (1969) *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 3. Cambridge
- Habicht, C. (1984) "Pausanias and the evidence of inscriptions", *Classical Antiquity* 3: 40–56
- (1985) *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Sather Classical Lectures 50). Berkeley and London
- Hagen, H. (1867) *Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica* (Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, Suppl. 4). Leipzig
- Hägg, R. (ed.) (1983) *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1–5 June 1981*. Stockholm
- Hägg, T. (1989) "Hermes and the invention of the lyre. An unorthodox version", *Symbolae Osloenses* 64: 36–73
- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford
- (1999) "Actor's song in tragedy", in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 96–122
- (2000) "Female figures and metapoetry in Old Comedy", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 407–18
- Hallberg, R. von (ed.) (1984) *Canons*. Chicago and London
- Halperin, D. M., Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) (1990) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton

- Hammond, N. G. L. (1955) "Studies in Greek chronology of the sixth and fifth centuries BC", *Historia* 4: 371–81
- (1967) *A History of Greece to 322 BC*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- and Scullard, H. H. (eds.) (1970) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Hankinson, R. J. (2002) *Simplicius' Commentary on Aristotle's On the Heavens*. London
- Hansen, M. H. and Raafaub, K. (eds.) (1995) *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Historia Einzelschriften 95). Stuttgart
- Hansen, P. A. (1983–89) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols. Berlin
- Hardwick, N. M. N. (1991) *The Coinage of Chios from the Sixth Century to the Fourth Century BC*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Oxford University
- Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge MA and London
- Harrison, E. B. (1979) "The iconography of the Eponymous Heroes on the Parthenon and in the Agora", in Mørkholm and Waggoner (eds.), 71–85
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.) (2001) *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*. Oxford
- Harvey, A. E. (1955) "The classification of Greek lyric poetry", *CQ* 49: 157–75
- Harvey, D. (2000a) "Phrynichos and his Muses", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 91–134
- (2000b) "Response: the context of Hermippus fr. 57", in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 280–4
- and Wilkins, J. (eds.) (2000) *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London
- Haskins, E. V. (2004) *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle*. Columbia
- Haupt, M. (1876) "Index lectionum hibernarum 1862 [De Chii versibus Ionis apud Athenaeum XI, p.463]", in *Mauricii Hauptii Opuscula*, vol. 2. Leipzig, 207–17
- Haviaras, N. (1994) *The Myth of the Death of Ajax in Greek Poetry up to Sophocles*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London
- Haworth, K. R. (1980) *Deified Virtues, Demonic Vices and Descriptive Allegory in Prudentius' Psychomachia*. Amsterdam
- Headlam, W. (1893) "Various conjectures II", *Journal of Philology* 21: 75–100
- Heiberg, J. L. and Menge, H. (1883–1916) *Euclid's opera omnia*, 8 vols. Leipzig
- Heinze, R. (1892) *Xenocrates*. Stuttgart
- Hellström, P. and Alroth, B. (eds.) (1996) *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Boreas 24). Uppsala
- Henderson, J. G. W. (2001) "From Megalopolis to Cosmopolis: Polybius, or there and back again", in Goldhill (ed.), 29–49
- Henderson, J. J. (1987) *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*. Oxford
- (1991) *The Maculate Muse*, 2nd edn. New Haven
- (1998) *Aristophanes Clouds, Wasps, Peace* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA and London
- Henrichs, A. (1975) "Philodems 'De pietate' als mythographische Quelle", *Cronache Ercolanesi* 5: 5–38
- (1985) "Zur Genealogie des Musaïos", *ΣPE* 58: 1–8
- Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.) (2002) *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford
- Herington, J. (1985) *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Sather Classical Lectures 49). Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Herman, G. (1987) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge
- Herrmann, K. (1992) "Die Schatzhäuser in Olympia", in Coulson and Kyrieleis (eds.), 25–32
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1989) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey II: Books 9–16*. Oxford
- , West, S., and Hainsworth, J. B. (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey I: Books 1–8*. Oxford

- Hicks, R. D. (1925) *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of the Eminent Philosophers* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 1. Cambridge MA and London
- (1931) *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of the Eminent Philosophers* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 2, rev. edn. Cambridge MA and London
- Hilgard, A. (1894) *Grammatici Graeci IV.1. Prolegomena: Theodosii Alexandrini Canones, Georgii Choerobosci Scholia, Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini*. Leipzig
- Hoesch, N. (1990) "Männer im Luxusgewand", in Vierendeel and Kaeser (eds.), 276–9
- Hofmann, H. and Harder, A. (eds.) (1991) *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente*. Göttingen
- Holquist, M. (1981) "Introduction", in Bakhtin (1981), xv–xxxiii
- Holwerda, D. (1977) *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars I, Fasc. III 1: Scholia vetera in Nubes*. Groningen
- (1982) *Scholia in Aristophanem Pars II: Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam. Fasc. II: Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Pacem*. Groningen
- Homeyer, H. (1962) "Zu den Anfängen der griechischen Biographie", *Philologus* 106: 75–85
- Hood, M. S. F. (1986) "Mycenaeans in Chios", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 169–80
- Hopkins, K. (1978) "Rules of evidence", *JRS* 68: 178–86
- (1993) "Novel evidence for Roman slavery", *P&P* 138: 3–27
- Hordern, J. H. (2002) *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford
- (2003) "Gnesippus and the Rivals of Aristophanes", *CQ* 53.2: 608–13
- Hornblower, S. (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides I–III*. Oxford
- (1994b) "Introduction", in Hornblower (ed.) (1994a), 1–72
- (1994c) "Narratology and narrative techniques in Thucydides", in Hornblower (ed.) (1994a), 131–66
- (1996) *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume II: Books IV–V.24*. Oxford
- (2000) "The Old Oligarch (Pseudo-Xenophon's *Athenaion Politeia*) and Thucydides. A fourth-century date for the *Old Oligarch*?", in Flensted-Jensen, Nielson and Rubinstein (eds.), 363–84
- (2002) *The Greek World 479–323 BC*, 3rd edn. London and New York
- (ed.) (1994a) *Greek Historiography*. Oxford
- and Spawforth, A. (eds.) (1996) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn. Oxford and New York
- and Spawforth, A. (forthcoming) "The Oxford Classical Dictionary ed. 3 (1996): conservatism and innovation", in Kazazis and Rengakos (eds.)
- Hose, B. (1993) "Kratinos und der Bau des perikleischen Odeions", *Philologus* 137: 3–11
- Hubbard, T. K. (1986) "Pegasus' bridle and the poetics of Pindar's *Thirteenth Olympian*", *HSCP* 90: 27–48
- Huber, L. (1965) "Herodots Homerverständnis", in Flashar and Gaiser (eds.), 29–52
- Hude, K. (1912) *Herodoti Historiae*, 3rd edn. Oxford
- Huffman, C. A. (1999) "The Pythagorean tradition", in Long (ed.), 66–87
- (2002) "Polyclète et les présocratiques", in Laks and Louguet (eds.), 303–27
- Humphreys, S. C. (1978) *Anthropology and the Greeks*. London
- Hunger, H. (1967) "Palimpsest-fragmente aus Herodians ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΔΙΑ, Buch 5–7. *Cod. Vindob. Hist. gr.* 10", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16: 1–33
- Hunt, A. S. (1911) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri VIII*. London
- Hunt, D. W. S. (1947) "Feudal survivals in Ionia", *JHS* 67: 68–76
- Hunter, R. L. (1997) "(B)ionic man: Callimachus' iambic programme", *PCPS* 43: 41–52
- (1999) *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge
- Hurst, A. (ed.) (1985) *Pindare* (Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique 31). Geneva

- Huxley, G. L. (1965) "Ion of Chios", *GRBS* 6: 29–46
- (1969a) *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*. London
- (1969b) "Choirilos of Samos", *GRBS* 10: 12–29
- Iannucci, A. (2002) *La parola e l'azione: i frammenti simposiali di Crizia*. Bologna
- Irwin, E. (1974) *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*. Toronto
- Jacobs, F. (1794) *Anthologia Graeca sive poetarum Graecorum lusus, ex rec. Brunckii. Indices et comment. adiecit F. Jacobs*, vol. 1.1. Leipzig
- (1798) *Anthologia Graeca sive poetarum Graecorum lusus, ex rec. Brunckii. Indices et comment. adiecit F. Jacobs*, vol. 6. Leipzig
- Jacoby, F. (1909) "Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente", *Klio* 9: 80–123. Reprinted in Jacoby (1956), 16–64
- (1923–) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin and Leiden
- (1945) "Some Athenian epigrams from the Persian Wars", *Hesperia* 14: 157–211
- (1947a) "Some remarks on Ion of Chios", *CQ* 41: 1–17
- (1947b) "The first Athenian prose writer", *Mnemosyne* 13: 13–64
- (1949) *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford
- (1956) *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Leiden
- Jahn, O. and Michaelis, A. (1901) *Arx Athenarum a Pausania descripta*. Bonn
- Jan, C. (1895) *Musici Scriptores Graeci*. Leipzig
- Janko, R. (1992) *The Iliad: A Commentary IV: Books 13–16*. Cambridge
- (2001) "The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apophrygizontes Logoi?*): a new translation", *CP* 96: 1–32.
- Janssen, T. H. (1984) *Timotheus Persae. A Commentary* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 6). Amsterdam
- Jarcho, V. N. (1987) "Zu dem neuen Mimos-Fragment (P. Oxy. 53, 3700)", *ζPE* 70: 32–4
- Jeffery, L. (1956) "The courts of justice in archaic Chios", *ABSA* 51: 157–67
- Jennings, V. (1996) *Reincarnation in Early Greek Thought*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Adelaide
- Jensen, C. (1917) *Hyperidis orationes sex*. Leipzig
- Johnston, S. I. (2002) "Myth, festival and poet: the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* and its performative context", *CP* 97: 109–32
- Jones, C. P. (1966) "Towards a chronology of Plutarch's works", *JRS* 56: 61–74. Reprinted in Scardigli (ed.) (1995), 95–123
- (1993) "Greek drama in the Roman Empire", in Scodel (ed.), 39–52
- (2001) "Pausanias and his guides", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 33–9
- Jones, W. H. S. and Ormerod, H. A. (1926) *Pausanias: Description of Greece*, vol. 2 (Loeb Classical Library). London and New York
- Jonker, G. H. (1970) *The Harmonics of Manuel Bryennius*. Groningen
- Jouanna, J. (1998) "Le sourire des Tragiques grecs [chez Ion de Chios]", in Trédé, Hoffmann and Auvray-Assayas (eds.), 161–76
- Kahn, C. H. (1973) *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek*. Dordrecht
- (1974) "Pythagorean philosophy before Plato", in Mourelatos (ed.), 161–85
- (1996) *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue. The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form*. Cambridge
- Kaimio, M. (1977) *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 53). Helsinki
- Kallet, L. (1998) "Accounting for culture in fifth-century Athens", in Boedeker and Raafaub (eds.), 43–58
- Kampen, N. (1996) "Omphale and the instability of gender", in Kampen (ed.), 233–46
- Kampen, N. (ed.) (1996) *Sexuality in Ancient Art*. Cambridge

- Karetsoy, A. (2002) "Prologue", in Mylopotamitaki (ed.), xxv–xxvi
- Katsaros, A. H. (2001) *Literary Perspectives on Ps. Xenophon's Athenaion Politeia*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Adelaide
- Kazazis, I. N. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (forthcoming) *The Lexicography of Greek Culture, Ancient, Medieval and Modern. The Contemporary Encyclopedic Lexica*. Thessaloniki
- Kearns, E. (1989) *The Heroes of Attica* (BICS Supplement 57). London
- Kelly, M. (ed.) (1966) *For Service to Classical Studies: Essays in Honour of Francis Letters*. Melbourne
- Kerferd, G. B. (1981) *The Sophistic Movement*. Cambridge
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford
- Kern, O. (1972) *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, 3rd edn. Dublin and Zürich
- Kießling, T. (1826) *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiarum Variarum Chiliades*. Leipzig
- Killen, J. T. (1992–93) "The oxen's names on the Knossos Ch tablets", *Minos* 27–28: 101–7
- King, J. E. (1927) *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations* (Loeb Classical Library). London and New York
- Kinzl, K. H. (ed.) (1977) *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the Occasion of his 80. Birthday*. Berlin
- Kirchhoff, A. (1871) "Zur Geschichte des attischen Epigramms", *Hermes* 5: 48–60
- Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 1. Cambridge
- (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 2. Cambridge
- , Raven, J. E. and Schofield, M. (1983) *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, 2nd edn. Cambridge
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1965) "Homer and Sophocles' Ajax", in Anderson (ed.), 51–70
- Kiso, A. (1984) *The Lost Sophocles*. New York
- Klein, T. M. (1974) "The role of Callimachus in the development of the counter-genre", *Latomus* 33: 217–31
- Knight, J. (2000) "Welsh stones and Oxford scholars: three rediscoveries", in Cooley (ed.), 91–101
- Koehler, U. (1894) "Aus dem Leben des Dichters Ion", *Hermes* 29: 156–8
- Koepke, E. S. (1836) *De Ionis Chii poetae vita et fragmentis*. Berlin
- Kokolakis, M. (1992) "Intellectual activity on the fringes of the Games", in Coulson and Kyrieleis (eds.), 153–8
- König, J. and Whitmarsh, T. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge
- Kopytoff, I. (1986) "The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process", in Appadurai (ed.) (1986a), 64–91
- Koraes, A. (1811) *Ὅμηρου Ἰλιάδος*, vol. 1. Paris
- (1978) *Ὁ Παπατρέχας* (ed. A. Angelou). Athens
- Koster, W. J. W. (1961) *Scripta Academica Groningana Pars IV: Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem. Fasc. III: Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves, Argumentum Equitum*. Groningen
- Kotsidu, H. (1991) *Die musischen Agone der Panathenäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Munich
- Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford
- Kranz, W. (1934) "Vorsokratisches II", *Hermes* 69: 226–8
- (1935) "Vorsokratisches III", *Hermes* 70: 111–9
- Kraus, C. S. (ed.) (1999) *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden, Boston and Köln
- Kresic, S. (ed.) (1981) *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts*. Ottawa
- Kron, U. (1976) *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen*. Berlin
- Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N. and Seidensticker, B. (eds.) (1999) *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Texte zur Forschung 72). Darmstadt

- Kubler, G. (1962) *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven
- Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca
- (1992) "The politics of ἀβροσύνη in archaic Greece", *CA* 11: 90–121
- (1999) *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton
- Kyrieleis, H. (1993) "The Heraion at Samos", in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 125–53
- La Penna, A. (1955) "Marginalia 17. De Ionis Chii fragmento quod tradit Athenaeus XIII 603E ss.", *Maia* 7: 145–6
- Lacey, P. de (1966) "Galen and the Greek poets", *GRBS* 7: 259–66
- Lada-Richards, I. (1999) *Initiating Dionysus: Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs*. Oxford
- Lafond, Y. (1996) "Pausanias et l'histoire du Péloponnèse depuis la conquête romaine", in Bingen (ed.), 167–205
- Laks, A. (1998) "Éditer l'influence? Remarques sur la section C du chapitre Diogène d'Apollonie dans les 'Fragmente der Vorsokratiker' de Diels-Kranz", in Burkert *et al.* (eds.), 89–105
- and Louguet, C. (eds.) (2002) *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie présocratique?* (Cahiers de philologie 20). Villeneuve d'Ascq
- Lamb, W. R. M. (1925) *Plato III. Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge MA
- Lamberton, R. (2001) *Plutarch*. New Haven and London
- Landels, J. (1999) *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*. London and New York
- Langslow, D. R. (2002) "Approaching bilingualism in corpus languages", in Adams, Janse and Swain (eds.), 23–51
- Lanza, D. and Longo, O. (eds.) (1989) *Il meraviglioso e il verosimile tra antichità e medioevo*. Firenze
- Lardinois, A. and McClure, L. (eds.) (2001) *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton and Oxford
- Latte, K. (1925) "Glossographika", *Philologus* 80: 136–75
- (1953–66) *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Hauniae
- Lausberg, H. with Orton, D. E. and Dean Anderson, R. (1998) *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Leiden
- Lavecchia, S. (2000) *Pindari Dithyrambi Fragmenta*. Rome and Pisa
- Lawrence, A. W. (1972) *Greek and Roman Sculpture*. London
- Leaf, W. (1902) *The Iliad II: Books 13–24*, 2nd edn. London and New York
- Lee, H. M. (1988) "The 'first' Olympic Games of 776 BC", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 110–8
- Leest, J. vander (1985) "Lucian in Egypt", *GRBS* 26: 75–82
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1981) *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London
- Lehnus, L. (1984) "Ancora Ione di Chio *TrGF* 19 F 17a", *QUCC* 46: 137–9
- Lejeune, M. (1963) "Noms propres de boeufs à Cnossos", *REG* 76: 1–9
- Lendle, O. (1992) *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung von Hekataios bis Zosimos*. Darmstadt
- Lentz, A. (1867–70) *Herodiani Technici reliquiae* (Grammatici Graeci 3.1–2). Leipzig
- Leppert, R. (1993) *The Sight of Sound: Music, Representation, and the History of the Body*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Lesky, A. (1966) *A History of Greek Literature*. London (German 2nd edn. 1963)
- (1967) *Greek Tragedy*, 2nd edn. London and New York (German 3rd edn. 1964)
- (1983) "Ion, Agathon, and Kritias", in *Greek Tragic Poetry*, 394–485. New Haven
- Léotoulon, F. (ed.) (1997) *Hommage à Milman Parry: le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique*. Amsterdam
- Leurini, L. (1973) "A proposito di Kairos", *PP* 28: 207–9
- (1980) "Annotazioni su alcuni frammenti di Ione di Chio (*TrGF* 19 Ion F 53c, 62 e 65 Snell)", *QUCC* 35: 117–26
- (1981) "Ἰὼν ὁ βόρειος ἱππὸς di Ione di Chio (19 F 17a Sn.)", *QUCC* 38: 155–61

- (1983) "Alcune glosse di Esichio relative a Ione di Chio", *QUCC* 42: 145–56
- (1984) "Nuovi frammenti di Ione di Chio dal *Lessico* di Fozio", *SIFC* 2 (ser. 3): 156–73
- (1985) "La Sude, Callimaco e la πολυείδεια di Ione di Chio", *AFLC* 6: 5–13
- (1987) "Pedanti a confronto. A proposito di Ione di Chio fr. 8 Bl.", *QUCC* 54: 131–9
- (1990) "Appunti sulla produzione scenica di Ione di Chio", *AFLC* 11: 5–31
- (1991) "Le ΕΠΙΔΗΜΙΑΙ di Ione di Chio", *AFLC* 12: 99–118
- (1992) *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23), 1st edn. Amsterdam.
- (2000a) *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23), 2nd edn. Amsterdam
- (2000b) "Una concordanza ai frammenti di Ione di Chio", *AFLC* 18: 97–152
- Leutsch, E. L. von (1846) "Das Grab des Sophokles", *Philologus* 1: 128–33
- and Schneidewin, F. G. (1839–51) *Corpus Pseudoepigraphorum Graecorum*, 2 vols. Göttingen
- Levin, F. R. (1961) "The hendecachord of Ion of Chios", *TAPA* 92: 295–307
- Levy, C. and Pernot, L. (eds.) (1997) *Dire l'évidence* (Cahiers de philosophie de l'Université de Paris XII, Val de Marne, no. 2). Montreal
- Lewis, D. M. (1992) "Mainland Greece, 479–451 BC", and "Chronological notes", in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5, 2nd edn, 96–120 and 499–505. Cambridge
- Lindsay, J. (1965) *The Clashing Rocks: A Study of Early Greek Religion and Culture and the Origins of Drama*. London
- Lirussi, L. (1952) "Due vasi attici con scene della *Ptocheia* di Sofocle", *Dioniso* 15: 164–75
- Lissarrague, F. (1990) *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet. Images of Wine and Ritual*. Princeton (French original 1987)
- Littlewood, R. J. (1975) "Ovid's Lupercales (*Fasti* 2.267–452): a study in the artistry of the *Fasti*", *Latomus* 34: 1060–72
- Lloyd, A. B. (ed.) (1977) *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*. London
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (2003) *In the Grip of Disease: Studies in the Greek Imagination*. Oxford
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1957) "Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*", *CQ* 7: 12–27
- (1981) "Notes on P. Turner 4 (Aristophanes, *Poiesis*)", *ZPE* 42: 23–5
- (1985) "Pindar and the afterlife", in Hurst (ed.), 245–83
- (1990a) "The *Meropis* (SH 903A)", in *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, 21–9. Oxford. Originally published 1984 in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, vol. 1, 141–52. Naples
- (1990b) "Addendum 1989 (to 'Pindar and the Afterlife')", in *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, 105–9. Oxford
- and Parsons, P. (1983) *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin and New York
- Lobeck, C. A. (1835) *Sophoclis Ajax. Commentario perpetuo illustravit*, 2nd edn. Leipzig
- Lobel, E. (1956) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXXIII*. London
- (1968) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXXV*. London
- and Page, D. (1955) *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*. Oxford
- Long, A. A. (1986) "Diogenes Laërtius, Life of Arcesilaus", *Elenchos* 7: 429–49
- (1988) "Socrates in Hellenistic philosophy", *CQ* 38: 150–71
- (ed.) (1999) *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*. Cambridge
- Long, H. S. (1964) *Diogenes Laertii vitae philosophorum*, 2 vols. Oxford
- Loomis, W. T. (1992) *The Spartan War Fund: IG V 1,1 and a New Fragment* (Historia Einzelschriften 74). Stuttgart
- Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge MA
- (1990) "Herakles: the super-male and the feminine", in Halperin *et al.* (eds.), 21–52
- (2000) *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens*. Ithaca

- Lotze, D. (1962) "Mothakes", *Historia* 11: 427–35
- Lucas, D. W. (1959) *The Greek Tragic Poets*, 2nd edn. London
- Luppe, W. (1984) "ΣΕΛΑΗΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ", *ΖΠΕ* 55: 8
- Luraghi, N. (ed.) (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford
- Ma, J. (1994) "Black hunter variations", *PCPS* 40: 49–80
- Maas, M. and Snyder, J. M. (1989) *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*. New Haven and London
- Maass, E. (1925) "Eunuchos und Verwandtes", *RhM* 74: 432–76
- Macchioro, V. (1914) "Derivazioni pittoriche da un ditrambo di Ion", *Neapolis* 2: 254–82
- MacDowell, D. M. (1986) *Spartan Law*. Edinburgh
- (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens: An Introduction to the Plays*. Oxford
- Maehler, H. (1970) *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis post Brunonem Snell*. Leipzig
- Mähly, J. (1889) "Zur vita Sophoclis", *Philologus* 48: 555–7
- Malkin, I. (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden
- Mallwitz, A. (1988) "Cult and competition locations at Olympia", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 79–109
- Mandel, J. and Rosenberg, B. A. (eds.) (1970) *Medieval Literature and Folklore Studies: Essays in Honour of Francis Lee Utley*. New Brunswick NJ
- Manganaro, G. (1997) "Filologia classica e realtà ambientali antiche", *ΖΠΕ* 117: 103–6
- Mansfeld, J. and Runia, D. T. (1997) *Aēthiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer. I: The Sources*. Leiden, New York and Köln
- Marcovich, M. (1971) "Notes on *Vita Sophoclis*", *Emerita* 34: 341–4
- Marinatos, N. and Hägg, R. (eds.) (1993) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*. London and New York
- Marincola, J. (1999) "Genre, convention, and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography", in Kraus (ed.), 281–324
- Marrou, H.-I. (1956) *History of Education in Antiquity*. New York (French original, 3rd edn., 1956)
- Marshall, A. J. (1976) "Library resources and creative writing at Rome", *Phoenix* 30: 252–64
- Marshall, C. W. (1996) "Literary awareness in Euripides and his audience", in Worthington (ed.), 81–98
- Martin, J. (1974) *Scholia in Aratum vetera*. Stuttgart
- Martin, R. P. (2001) "Just Like a Woman: enigmas of the lyric voice", in Lardinois and McClure (eds.), 55–74
- (2003) "The pipes are brawling: conceptualizing musical performance in classical Athens", in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.) (2003a), 153–80
- Marx, F. (1934) "Critica et hermeneutica", *RhM* 83: 376–9
- Marzi, G. (1988) "Il 'Decreto' degli Spartani contro Timoteo", in Gentili and Pretagostini (eds.), 264–72
- Marzullo, B. (1994) "Suda I 487 (de Ione Chio)", *Museum Criticum* 29: 319–30
- (1995–96) "Ion, fr. 59 Sn. (ex Omphale?)", *Museum Criticum* 30–1: 127–35
- Mattingly, H. B. (1977) "Poets and politicians in fifth century Greece", in Kinzl (ed.), 231–45
- Maund, M. P. (1987) *Versatile*. Writtle
- McClary, S. (1991) *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minnesota
- McGibbon, D. (1964) "Metempsychosis in Pindar", *Phronesis* 9: 5–11
- McGing, B. C. and Mossman, J. M. (eds.) (2006) *Biographical Limits*. Swansea
- Meiggs, R. (1949) "A note on Athenian imperialism", *CR* 63: 9–12
- (1972) *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford
- and Lewis, D. (1988) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, 2nd edn. Oxford
- Meineke, A. (1840) *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*, vol. 3. Berlin

- (1841) *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4. Berlin
- (1855) *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, vol. 1. Leipzig
- (1857) *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, vol. 4. Leipzig
- (1858–67) *Athenaei Deipnosophistae*. Leipzig
- Meinhardt, E. (1957) *Perikles bei Plutarch*. Diss. Frankfurt
- Meister, K. (1978) “Stesimbrotus’ Schrift über die athenischer Staatsmänner”, *Historia* 27: 274–94
- Mejer, J. (1978) *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background* (Hermes Einzelschriften 40). Stuttgart
- Mekler, S. (1905) “Bericht über die griechischen Tragiker betreffende Literatur der Jahre 1898–1902”, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 125: 179–256
- Menge, H. (1916) *Euclidis opera omnia*, vol. 8. Leipzig
- Meritt, B. D. (1945) “Attic inscriptions of the fifth century”, *Hesperia* 14: 61–133
- Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford
- Millar, F. (1981) “The World of the Golden Age”, *JRS* 71: 63–75
- (1868) *Mélanges de littérature grecque*. Paris
- Miller, M. (1997) *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge
- Miller, S. G. (1992) “The stadium at Nemea and the Nemean Games”, in Coulson and Kyrieleis (eds.), 81–6
- Millett, P. (1998) “Encounters in the Agora”, in Cartledge, Millett and von Reden (eds.), 203–28
- Miralles, C. (1971) “La renovación de la elegía en la época clásica”, *BIEH* 5.2: 13–31
- (1993) “Dionysio Calco: tradizione e innovazione nell’elegia del V secolo”, in Pretagostini (ed.), 501–12
- Misch, G. (1950) *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, vols. 1 and 2 (German 3rd edn. 1949–50). London
- Mitchell, L. G. (1997) *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435–323 BC*. Cambridge
- Moggi, M. (1996) “L’excursus di Pausania sulla Ionia”, in Bingen (ed.), 79–116
- Momigliano, A. (1993) *The Development of Greek Biography*, 2nd edn. Cambridge MA
- Mondolfo, R. (1975) “Testimonios sobre Heráclito anteriores a Platón”, *Revista Venezolana de Filosofía* 3: 75–117
- Montgomery, H. (1996) “Piety and persuasion in mythology and religion in fourth-century Athenian oratory”, in Hellström and Alroth (eds.), 125–32
- Montiglio, S. (1999) “Paroles dancées en silence: l’action signifiante de la pantomime e le moi du danseur”, *Phoenix* 53: 26–80
- (2000) *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton
- Moreno, P. (1990) “Kairos”, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, vol. 5, 920–6 and 597–8. Zürich
- Morgan, C. (1990) *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge
- (1993) “The origins of pan-Hellenism”, in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 18–44
- (1994) “The evolution of a sacred ‘landscape’: Isthmia, Perachora, and the early Corinthian state”, in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 105–42
- Morgan, K. A. (1994) “Socrates and Gorgias at Delphi and Olympia: *Phaedrus* 235d6–236b4”, *CQ* 44: 375–386
- (ed.) (2003) *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin
- Mørkholm, O. and Waggoner, N. M. (eds.) (1979) *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology: Essays in Honour of Margaret Thompson*. Wetteren
- Morris, I. (1964) *The World of the Shining Prince*. Oxford
- Morris, S. (2003) “Imaginary kings: alternatives to monarchies in early Greece”, in Morgan (ed.), 1–12

- Morrison, D. (1987) "On Professor Vlastos' Xenophon", *Anc. Phil.* 7: 9–22
- Mosconi, G. (2000) "La democrazia ateniese e la 'nuova' musica: l'Odeion di Pericle", in Cassio, Musti and Rossi (eds.), 217–316
- Mossman, J. M. (1988) "Tragedy and epic in Plutarch's *Alexander*", *JHS* 108: 83–93. Reprinted in Scardigli (ed.) (1995), 209–28
- Mourelatos, A. P. D. (1970) *The Route of Parmenides. A Study of Words, Image, and Argument in the Fragments*. New Haven
- (ed.) (1974) *The Pre-Socratics*. New York
- Müller, C. (1843–70) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols. Paris
- (1882) *Geographi Graeci Minores*, vol. 2. Paris
- Murray, G. (1933) *Aristophanes: A Study*. Oxford
- Murray, O. (1980) *Early Greece*. London
- (1987) "Herodotus and oral history", in Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Kuhrt (eds.), 93–115. Revised in Luraghi (ed.), 16–44
- (1990b) "The Affair of the Mysteries: democracy and the drinking group", in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 149–61
- (1990c) "The Solonian law of *hubris*", in Cartledge, Millett and Todd (eds.), 139–145
- (1991) "War and the Symposium", in Slater (ed.), 83–103
- (ed.) (1990a) *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford
- and Tecusan, M. (eds.) (1995) *In vino veritas*. London
- Murray, P. (1997) *Plato on Poetry*. Cambridge
- (2004) "The Muses and their arts", in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 365–89
- and Wilson, P. (eds.) (2004) *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford
- Musti, D. (1996) "La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania", in Bingen (ed.), 9–43
- (2000) "Musica greca tra aristocrazia e democrazia", in Cassio, Musti and Rossi (eds.), 7–55
- Mylopotamitaki, A. K. (ed.) (2002) Οἶνος Παλαιός Ἡδύποτος. Τὸ Κρητικὸ Κρασί ἀπὸ τὰ Προϊστορικά ὡς τὰ Νεότερα Χρόνια. Herakleion
- Naber, S. A. (1864–65) *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*, 2 vols. Leiden
- Nagy, G. (1973) "Phaethon, Sappho's Phaon, and the White Rock of Leukas", *HSCP* 77: 137–77. Revised in Nagy (1990b), 223–62
- (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore
- (1985) "Theognis and Megara: a poet's vision of his city", in Figueira and Nagy (eds.), 82–95
- (1990a) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore
- (1990b) *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca and London
- (2002) *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*. Washington DC and Athens
- Nails, D. (2002) *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics*. Indianapolis
- Naoumides, M. (1968) "New fragments of ancient Greek poetry", *GRBS* 9: 267–90
- (1969) "The fragments of Greek lexicography in the papyri", in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by His Students and Colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924–1960* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 58). Urbana, 181–202
- Nauck, A. (1851) "Zweiter Nachtrag zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Tragiker", *Philologus* 6: 385–404
- (1857) "Zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Tragiker", *Philologus* 12: 193–6
- Nauck, A. (1889) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2nd edn. Leipzig
- Neer, R. (2003) "Framing the gift: the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the politics of public art", in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.) (2003a), 129–49

- Neil, R. A. (1901) *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Cambridge
- Neils, J. (1987) *The Youthful Deeds of Theseus* (Archaeologica 76). Rome
- (ed.) (1992) *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaia Festival in Ancient Athens*. Hanover and Princeton
- Nelson, R. S. (ed.) (2000) *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance*. Cambridge
- Nicholson, N. (2003) "Aristocratic victory memorials and the absent charioteer", in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.) (2003a), 101–28
- Nicolai, R. (2001) "Thucydides' archaeology", in Luraghi (ed.), 263–85
- Nieberding, K. (1836) *De Ionis Chii vita moribus et studiis doctrinae scripsit*. Leipzig
- Niedermeyer, H. (1939) "Aristoteles und der Begriff des Nomos bei Lykophron", in *Festschrift Paul Koschaker*, vol. 3, 140–171. Weimar
- Nijf, O. van (2000) "Inscriptions and civic memory in the Roman East", in Cooley (ed.), 21–36
- Nilsson, M. P. (1948) *Greek Piety*. Oxford
- Nisetich, F. J. (1988) "Immortality in Acragas: poetry and religion in Pindar's Second *Olympian Ode*", *CPh* 83: 1–19
- Noël, M. P. (1998) "*Kairos* sophistique et mises en forme du *logos* chez Gorgias", *RPh* 72: 233–45, 326
- Norman, A. F. (1960) "The book trade in fourth century Antioch", *JHS* 80: 122–6
- (1965) *Libanius' Autobiography (Oration 1)*. The Greek Text. Oxford and Hull
- North, H. (1966) *Sophrosyne: Self-knowledge and Self-restraint in Greek Literature* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 35). Ithaca
- O'Neil, J. L. (1978–79) "The constitution of Chios in the fifth century BC", *Talanta* 10–11: 66–73
- (1995) *The Origins and Development of Ancient Greek Democracy*. Lanham, MD
- O'Sullivan, N. (1996) "Written and spoken in the First Sophistic", in Worthington (ed.), 115–27
- Obbink, D. (2001) "The genre of *Plataea*: generic unity in the New Simonides", in Boedeker and Sider (eds.), 65–85
- Ober, J. (1989) *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People*. Princeton
- Ogden, D. (1996) *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*. Oxford
- Ortony, A. (ed.) (1993) *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edn. Cambridge
- Osann, F. (1835) *Beiträge zur griechischen und römischen Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 1. Darmstadt
- Osborne, M. J. and Byrne, S. G. (1996) *The Foreign Residents of Athens: An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica* (Studia Hellenistica 33). Leuven
- Osborne, R. (1993) "Competitive festivals and the polis: a context for dramatic festivals at Athens", in Sommerstein (ed.), 21–38
- (1994) "Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the politics of sacred space in archaic Attica", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 143–60
- (2004) *The Old Oligarch: Pseudo-Xenophon's Constitution of the Athenians* (LAC-TOR 2), 2nd edn. London
- Ostwald, M. (1969) *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*. Oxford
- (1992) "Athens as a cultural centre", *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5, 2nd edn., 306–69. Cambridge
- (1995) "Public expense: whose obligation? Athens 600–454", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 139.4: 368–79
- (2000) *Oligarchia: The Development of a Constitutional Form in Ancient Greece* (Historia Einzelschriften 144). Stuttgart
- Pack, R. A. (1965) *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd edn. Ann Arbor
- Page, D. L. (1941) *Select Papyri III. Literary Papyri: Poetry* (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge MA
- (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford

- (1974) *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis poetarum lyricorum graecorum fragment quae recens innotuerunt*. Oxford
- Paley, F. A. (1873) *Aristophanes Peace*. London
- Palmer, L. R. (1963) *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. Oxford
- Panchenko, D. (1999) "The shape of the earth in Archelaus, Democritus and Leucippus", *Hyperboreus* 5: 22–39
- Papanghelis, T. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2001) *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden
- Papantoniou, G. A. (1951) "Once or twice?", *AJP* 72: 176–81
- Parker, H. N. (1993) "Sappho Schoolmistress", *TAPA* 123: 309–51
- Parker, L. P. E. (1997) *The Songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford
- Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford
- Paxson, J. J. (1994) *The Poetics of Personification*. Cambridge
- Pearson, A. C. (1917) *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 3 vols. Cambridge
- Pearson, L. (1939) *Early Ionian Historians*. Oxford
- Pechstein, N. and Krumeich, R. (1999) "Ion", in Krumeich, Pechstein and Seidensticker (eds.), 479–90
- Pelling, C. B. R. (1980) "Plutarch's adaptation of his source-material", *JHS* 100: 127–40. Reprinted in Scardigli (ed.) (1995), 125–54. Reprinted and revised in Pelling (2002), 91–115
- (1988) *Plutarch: Life of Antony*. Cambridge
- (1990a) "Childhood and personality in Greek biography", in Pelling (ed.) (1990b), 213–44. Reprinted and revised with a postscript in Pelling (2002), 301–47
- (1992) "Plutarch and Thucydides", in Stadter (ed.), 10–40. Reprinted and revised in Pelling (2002), 117–41
- (1996) "Biography, Greek", in Hornblower and Spawforth (eds.), 241–2
- (1997a) "Is death the end? Closure in Plutarch's *Lives*", in Roberts, Dunn and Fowler (eds.), 228–50. Reprinted and revised in Pelling (2002), 365–86
- (1999) "Epilogue", in Kraus (ed.), 325–60
- (2000) *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*. London
- (2002) *Plutarch and History*. London
- (ed.) (1990b) *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford
- (ed.) (1997b) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford
- (2006a) "Homer and Herodotus", in Clarke, Currie and Lyne (ed.), 75–104
- (2006b) "Breaking the bounds: writing about Julius Caesar", in McGing and Mossman (eds.)
- Pellizer, E. (1990) "Outlines of a morphology of symposium entertainment", in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 177–84
- Peradotto, J. (1997) "Homer, Parry and the meaning of tradition", in Létoublon (ed.), 23–31
- Perrin, B. (1916) *Plutarch's Lives* (Loeb Classical Library), vol. 3. Cambridge MA
- Perrysinakis, I. N. (1992) "Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the Homeric Epics", *Dodoni (Filologia)* 21: 79–120
- Petit, A. (1997) "Le silence pythagoricien", in Levy and Pernot (eds.), 287–96
- Petrusevski, M. D. (1961) "wo-no-qo-so", *Živa Antika* 11: 250
- Pfeiffer, R. (1921) *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*. Bonn
- (1922) *Kallimachosstudien: Untersuchungen zur Arsinoe und zu den Aitia des Kallimachos*. München
- (1934) *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten*. München
- (1949) *Callimachus I: Fragmenta*. Oxford
- (1955) "The future of studies in the field of Hellenistic poetry", *JHS* 75: 69–73
- (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford
- Philip, J. A. (1966) *Pythagoras and early Pythagoreanism* (Phoenix Suppl. 7). Toronto

- Philipp, H. (1990) "Zu Polyklets Schrift *Kanon*", in *Polyklet. Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik*, 135–55. Mainz am Rhein
- Piccirilli, L. (1998) "I testi biografici come testimonianza della storia della mentalità", in Ehlers (ed.), 147–88
- (1999) "Cimone in Ione di Chio", *Quaderni di storia* 49: 267–71
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1900) *Select Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets*. Oxford
- (1927) *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, 1st edn. Oxford
- (1933) "Tragedy", in Powell (ed.), 68–155
- (1939) Review of von Blumenthal (1939), *CR* 53: 174–5
- (1953) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 1st edn. Oxford
- (1962) *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd edn., revised by T. B. L. Webster. Oxford
- (1968) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd edn., revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford
- and Lucas, D. W. (1970) "Ion (2) of Chios", in Hammond and Scullard (eds.), 549–50
- Places, É. des (1969) *La religion grecque: dieux, cultes, rites et sentiment religieux dans la Grèce antique*. Paris
- Platnauer, M. (1964) *Aristophanes Peace*. Oxford
- Podlecki, A. J. (1987) *Plutarch Life of Pericles*. Bristol
- (1998) *Perikles and His Circle*. London and New York
- Polignac, F. de (1994) "Mediation, competition, and sovereignty: the evolution of rural sanctuaries in Geometric Greece", in Alcock and Osborne (eds.), 3–18
- Porson, R. (1822) ΦΩΤΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΟΥ ΛΕΞΕΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΤΩΓΗ *ex codice galeano descripsit*. Cambridge and London
- Porter, J. I. (2001) "Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 63–92
- Powell, A. (ed.) (1989) *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success*. London
- Powell, J. U. (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum graecorum aetatis ptol-emaicae 323–146 AC, epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*. Oxford
- (1929) "New epigrams from inscriptions of the fourth and following centuries BC", in Powell and Barber (eds.), 47–59
- (ed.) (1933) *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third Series: Some Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Classical and Later Periods*. Oxford
- and Barber, E. A. (eds.) (1929) *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Second Series: Some Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose, Chiefly of the Fourth Century BC and Later Times*. Oxford
- Pozzi, D. (1996) "Deianeira vere Oenei filia", *Hermes* 124: 104–8
- Preston, R. (2001) "Roman questions, Greek answers: Plutarch and the construction of identity", in Goldhill (ed.), 86–119
- Pretagostini, R. (ed.) (1993) *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica*. Rome
- Pritchett, W. K. (1971) *The Greek State at War*, vol. 1. Berkeley
- (1974) *The Greek State at War*, vol. 2. Berkeley
- (1999) *Pausanias Periegetes*, vol. 2. Amsterdam
- Privitera, G. A. (1991) "Aspetti musicali nella storia del ditirambo arcaico e tardo-arcaico", in Cassio and Cerri (eds.), 141–53
- Pulleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford
- Quincey, J. H. (1963) "Etymologica", *RhM* 106: 142–8
- Quinn, T. J. (1969) "Political groups at Chios: 412 BC", *Historia* 18: 22–30
- (1981) *Athens and Samos, Lesbos and Chios: 478–404 BC*. Manchester
- Race, W. H. (1981) "The word *kairos* in Greek drama", *TAPA* 111: 197–213
- (1982) "Aspects of rhetoric and form in Greek hymns", *GRBS* 23: 5–14
- (1990) *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. Atlanta
- (1992) "How Greek poems begin", *JCS* 29: 13–8

- (1997) *Pindar. I: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Cambridge MA and London
- Radt, S. (1977) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF). Volume 4: Sophocles*. Göttingen
- (1991) "Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten", in Hofmann and Harder (eds.), 79–109
- Raschke, W. J. (1988b) "Introduction", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 3–10
- (1988c) "Images of victory: some new considerations of athletic monuments", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 38–54
- (ed.) (1988a) *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*. Madison
- Rasmussen, T. and Spivey, N. J. (eds.) (1991) *Looking at Greek Vases*. Cambridge
- Rathmann, W. (1933) *Quaestiones Pythagoraeae Orphicae Empedocleae*. Dissertation, Halle
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1966) "Greek inscriptions", *Hesperia* 35: 241–51
- (1988) "The Panhellenic idea and the Olympic Games", in Raschke (ed.) (1988a), 35–7
- and Jeffery, L. H. (1949) *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth centuries BC*. Cambridge MA
- Raven, J. E. (1948) *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*. Cambridge
- (1951) "Polyclitus and Pythagoreanism", *CQ* 45: 147–82
- Reddy, M. J. (1993) "The conduit metaphor: a case of frame conflict in our language about language", in Ortony (ed.), 164–201
- Reden, S. von (1995) *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London
- Reinach, T. (1901) "Un fragment d'Ion de Chios", *REG* 14: 8–19
- Reitzenstein, R. (1893) *Epigramm und Skolion: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen
- Relihan, J. C. (1992) "Rethinking the history of the literary symposium", *ICS* 17: 213–44
- Rengakos, A. (2001) "Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric scholar", in Papanghelis and Rengakos (eds.), 193–216
- (ed.) (1983) *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford
- and Wilson, N. G. (1991) *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd edn. Oxford
- Rhegas, Ph. (1797) *Χάρτα τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 2 vols. Wein. Reprinted 1971 Athens
- Rhodes, P. J. (1981) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford
- (1984) *Aristotle: The Athenian Constitution*. Harmondsworth
- (1992) "The Athenian revolution", in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5, 2nd edn., 62–95. Cambridge
- Rhomaïos, K. (1986) "The pseudo-Herodotean life of Homer and Chios", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 21–26
- Ricchiardelli Apicella, G. (1989) "Poesia e realtà. Ancora a proposito di Ione di Chio (fr 8. Bl.)", *QUCC* 61: 113–7
- Richardson, N. J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary VI: Books 21–24*. Cambridge
- Riedweg, C. (2002) *Pythagoras: Leben, Lehre, Nachwirkung*. München
- Ritter, F. (1843) "Vorgebliche Strategie des Sophokles gegen Samos: Ausführung seiner Antigone", *RhM* 2: 180–201
- Rives, J. (2001) "Civic and religious life", in Bodel (ed.) (2001a), 118–36
- Rivier, A. (1962) Review of Farina (1961), *Gnomon* 34: 831–3
- Roberts, D. H., Dunn, F. M. and Fowler, D. (eds.) (1997) *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton
- Roberts, E. S. and Gardner, E. A. (1887–1905) *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 2 vols. Cambridge
- Robertson, M. (1975) *A History of Greek Art*. Cambridge
- Robertson, N. (1964) *Nemesis*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Cornell University
- Robinson, T. M. (1979) *Contrasting Arguments: An Edition of the Dissoi Logoi*. New York
- Roebuck, C. (1986) "Chios in the sixth century", in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 81–8

- Roeper, G. (1870) "Zu Laertios Diogenes I", *Philologus* 30: 557–77
- Romilly, J. de (1968) *Time in Greek Tragedy*. Ithaca and London
- Rood, T. C. B. (1998) *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*. Oxford
- Rorty, R. (1989) "From ironist theory to private allusions", in *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*, 122–37. Cambridge
- Roscher, W. H. (ed.) (1890–94) *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, 6 vols in 9. Leipzig
- Rose, H. J. (1948) *A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian*, 3rd edn. London
- (1970) "Kairos", in Hammond and Scullard (eds.), 573
- and Arafat, K. (1996) "Kairos", in Hornblower and Spawforth (eds.), 806
- Rose, P. W. (1992) *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca
- Rose, V. (1871) "Ion's Reisebilder und Ioannes Alexandrinus der Arzt", *Hermes* 4: 205–15
- Rösler, W. (1990) "Mnemosyne in the symposion", in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 230–7
- (1995) "Wine and truth in the Greek symposion", in Murray and Tecusan (eds.), 106–12
- Ross, W. D. (1984) "Metaphysics", in Barnes (ed.), 2.1552–1728
- Rossi, L. (1971) "I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche", *BICS* 18: 69–94
- (1988) "La dottrina dell' 'ethos musicale' e il simposio", in Gentili and Pretagostini (eds.), 264–72
- Rostagni, A. (1927) "Un più completo frammento del 'Venice o Ceneo' di Jone di Chio (fr. 58 + 38 + 55 N²)", *RFIC* 5: 378–81
- Rowe, C. J. (1986) *Plato: Phaedrus*. Warminster
- Rubinstein, L. (1995) "Pausanias as a source for the classical Greek polis", in Hansen and Raaflaub (eds.), 211–9
- Rüdiger, H. (1966) "Göttin Gelegenheit: Gestaltwandel einer Allegorie", *Arcadia* 1: 121–66
- Runia, D. T. (1989) "Xenophanes on the moon: a *doxographicum* in Aëtius", *Phronesis* 34: 245–69
- (1992) "Xenophanes or Theophrastus? An Aëtian *Doxographicum* on the Sun", in Fortenbaugh and Gutas (eds.), 112–40
- Rupp, D. W. (1983) "Reflections on the development of altars in the eighth century BC", in Hägg (ed.), 101–7
- Russell, D. A. (1963) "Plutarch's Life of Coriolanus", *JRS* 53: 21–8. Reprinted in Scardigli (ed.) (1995), 357–72
- (1964) *Longinus' On the Sublime*. Oxford
- (1968) *Libellus de Sublimitate Dionysio Longo fere adscriptus*. Oxford
- and Wilson, N. G. (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford
- and Winterbottom, M. (1972) *Ancient Literary Criticism*. Oxford
- Russo, J. (1997) "Prose genres for the performance of traditional wisdom in ancient Greece: proverb, maxim, apothegm", in Edmunds and Wallace (eds.), 49–64
- Rutherford, I. (2001) "Tourism and the sacred: Pausanias and the traditions of Greek pilgrimage", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 40–52
- Rutherford, W. G. (1881) *The New Phrynichus, Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus*. London
- (1896) *Scholæ Aristophanica, Being Such Comments Adscript to the Text of Aristophanes as Have Been Preserved in the Codex Ravennas*, 3 vols. London
- Sakellariou, M. B. (1958) *La migration grecque en Ionie*. Athens
- Saller, R. (1980) "Anecdotes as historical evidence for the Principate", *G&R* 27: 69–83
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. and Kuhrt, A. (eds.) (1987) *Achaemenid History, II. The Greek Sources. Proceedings of the Groningen 1984 Achaemenid History Workshop*. Leiden

- Sandbach, F. H. (1958–59) “Ion of Chios on Pythagoras”, *PCPS* 5: 36
- Sandys, J. E. (1903–08) *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century BC to the End of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. Cambridge
- Sansone, D. (2004) “Heracles at the Y”, *JHS* 124: 125–42
- Sarikakis, Th. Ch. (1986) “Commercial relations between Chios and other Greek cities in antiquity”, in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), 121–31
- (1989) *Χιακή Προσωπογραφία*. Athens
- (1998) *Ἡ Χίος στήν Ἀρχαιότητα*. Athens
- Sarti, S. (1992) “Gli strumenti musicali di Apollo”, *AION* 14: 95–104
- Sauer, B. (1890–94) “Kairos”, in Roscher (ed.), 2.1: 897–901
- Scarcella, A. M. (1977) “Les structures socio-économiques du roman du Xénophon d’Ephèse”, *REG* 90: 249–62
- Scardigli, B. (ed.) (1995) *Essays on Plutarch’s Lives*. Oxford
- Schachermeyr, F. (1965) *Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift über die Staatsmänner* (SAWW 247.5). Wein
- Schachter, A. and Bingen, J. (eds.) (1992) *Le sanctuaire grec* (Entretiens Hardt sur l’antiquité classique 37). Geneva
- Schaffner, B. (1999) “Kairos, der rechte Augenblick”, in Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 6, 138–9. Stuttgart and Weimar
- Schauburg, K. (1960) “Herakles und Omphale”, *RhM* 103: 57–76
- (1979) “Herakles Musikos”, *JdI* 94: 49–76
- Scheer, E. (1958) *Lycophronis Alexandra. Volume 2: Scholia continens (editio altera ex editione anni MCMVIII Lucis Ope expressa)*. Berlin
- Schefold, K. (1982) “Oineus, Pandions Sohn”, *Revue archéologique* 2: 233–6
- Schenkeveld, D. (1996) “Plutarch’s first Table Talk (612e–615c)”, in Stockt (ed.) 257–64
- Schiappa, E. (1999) *The Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory in Classical Greece*. New Haven
- Schibli, H. S. (1990) *Pherekydes of Syros*. Oxford
- Schilbach, J. (1992) “Olympia, die Entwicklungsphasen des Stadions”, in Coulson and Kyrieleis (eds.), 33–7
- Schlesier, R. (1993) “Mixture of masks: maenads as tragic models”, in Carpenter and Faraone (eds.), 89–114
- Schlink, W. and Sperlich, M. (eds.) (1986) *Forma et Subtilitas. Festschrift für W. Schöne zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin and New York
- Schmalzriedt, E. (1970) *Peri Phuseôs. Zur Frühgeschichte der Buchtitel*. München
- Schmid, P. B. (1947) *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen*. Freiburg
- Schmidt, M. (1861) *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon post Ioannem Albertum*, vols 3 and 4. Jena
- (1862) “Kritische Bemerkungen”, *Philologus* 18: 226–34
- Schmiel, R. (1972) “Telemachus in Sparta”, *TAPA* 103: 463–72
- Schneider, O. (1873) *Callimachea. II. Fragmenta a Bentleio collecta et explicata, ab aliis aucta*. Leipzig
- Schneidewin, F. W. (1853) “Zu den Βίοι Αἰσχύλου καὶ Σοφοκλέους”, *Philologus* 8: 732–8
- Schofield, M. (1999) “Academic Epistemology”, in Algra *et al.* (eds.), 323–51
- Schöll, F. (1877) “Ueber Ion von Chios”, *RhM* 32: 145–59
- Schwartz, E. (1887) *Scholia in Euripidem. Volume 1: Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas*. Berlin: G
- (1891) *Scholia in Euripidem. Volume 2: Scholia in Hippolytum, Medeam, Alcestin, Andromacham, Rhesium, Troades*. Berlin
- Scodel, R. (2002) *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor
- (ed.) (1993) *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor
- Scott-Kilvert, I. (1960) *Plutarch: The Rise and Fall of Athens*. Harmondsworth
- Scullion, S. (2003) “Euripides and Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*”, *CQ* 53: 389–400
- Seaford, R. (1984) “The last bath of Agamemnon”, *CQ* 34: 247–54

- (2000) "The social function of Attic tragedy: a response to Jasper Griffin", *CQ* 50: 30–44
- Sealey, R. (1957) "The great earthquake in Lacedaemon", *Historia* 6: 368–71
- Séchan, L. (1926) *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris
- Sedley, D. (1989) "The proems of Empedocles and Lucretius", *GRBS* 30: 269–96
- (1999) "Parmenides and Melissus", in Long (ed.), 113–33
- Seidensticker, B. (2003) "The chorus in Greek satyrplay", in Csapo and Miller (eds.), 100–21
- Seng, H. (1988) "τὰ δίκαια beim Symposion", *QUCC* 59: 123–31
- Severyns, A. (1928) *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris
- Shapiro, H. A. (1992) "Mousikoi agones: music and poetry at the Panathenaia", in Neils (ed.), 53–76
- (1993) *Personifications in Greek Art. The Representation of Abstract Concepts, 600–400 BC*. Zürich
- Shrimpton, G. S. (1991) *Theopompos the Historian*. Montreal and Kingston
- Sifakis, G. M. (1971) *Parabasis and Animal Choruses: A Contribution to the History of Attic Comedy*. London
- Silk, M. (2001) "Pindar meets Plato: theory, language, value, and the classics", in Harrison (ed.), 26–45
- (2002) *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*. Oxford
- (2003) "Metaphor and metonymy: Aristotle, Jakobson, Ricoeur, and others", in Boys-Stones (ed.), 115–47
- Silk, M. S. (ed.) (1996) *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford
- Sinn, U. (1993) "Greek sanctuaries as places of refuge", in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 88–109
- Sitzler, J. (1881) Review of Buchholz (1880), *Philologische Rundschau* 1: 1074–83
- Skeat, T. C. (1982) "The length of the standard papyrus roll and the cost-advantage of the codex", *ZPE* 45: 169–75
- Slater, W. J. (1981) "Peace, the symposium and the poet", *ICS* 6.2: 205–14
- (1986) *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta post A. Nauck collegit, testimoniis ornavit, brevi commentario instruxit* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 6). Berlin and New York
- (ed.) (1991) *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor
- Smith, A. (1962) *The Architecture of Chios: Subsidiary Buildings, Implements and Crafts*. London
- Smith, A. (1993) *Porphyrii philosophi fragmenta*. Stuttgart
- Smith, A. C. (1999) "Eurymedon and the evolution of political personifications in the early classical period", *JHS* 119: 128–41
- Smith, B. H. (1984) "Contingencies of value", in von Hallberg (ed.), 5–39
- Smith, R. R. R. (1991) *Hellenistic Sculpture*. London
- Smith, W. (ed.) (1844–9) *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 3 vols. London
- Snell, B. (1971a) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Volume 1: Didascaliae tragicae, Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta tragicorum minorum*. Göttingen
- (1971b) *Frühgriechische Lyriker I: Die frühen Elegiker* (Schriften und Quellen der alten Welt 24.1). Berlin
- and Kannicht, R. (1986) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 1, 2nd edn. Göttingen
- and Maehler, H. (1987) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, 2 vols, 8th edn. Leipzig
- et al. (1955–) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen
- Kannicht, R. and Radt, S. (1971–85) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 4 vols. Göttingen
- Snodgrass, A. M. (2001) "Pausanias and the Chest of Kypselos", in Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (eds.), 127–41

- Sommerstein, A. H. (1981) *The Comedies of Aristophanes. Volume 2: Knights*. Warminster
- (1985) *The Comedies of Aristophanes. Volume 5: Peace*. Warminster
- (1987) *The Comedies of Aristophanes. Volume 6: Birds*. Warminster
- (1990) *The Comedies of Aristophanes. Volume 7: Lysistrata*. Warminster
- (1996) *The Comedies of Aristophanes, Volume 9: Frogs*. Warminster
- (ed.) (1993) *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference*. Bari
- Sorell, W. (1970) *The Duality of Vision in Genius and Versatility in the Arts*. London
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1993) "Early sanctuaries, the eighth century and ritual space: fragments of a discourse", in Marinatos and Hägg (eds.), 1–17
- Spanos, G. D. (1966) "Τὸ κρασί τῆς Ἀριουσίας", *Χιακή Ἐπιθεώρησις* 4: 48–61
- Stackmann, K. (1950) "Senecas Agamemnon: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Agamemnon-stoffes nach Aischylos", *C&M* 11: 180–221
- Stadter, P. A. (1987) "The rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*", *Anc. Soc.* 18: 251–69
- (1989) *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*. Chapel Hill and London
- (1991) "Pericles among the intellectuals", *ICS* 16: 111–24
- (ed.) (1992) *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*. London
- Stafford, E. (1998) "Masculine values, feminine forms: on the gender of personified abstractions", in Foxhall and Salmon (eds.), 43–56
- (2000) *Worshipping Virtues: Personifications and the Divine in Ancient Greece*. London
- and Herrin, J. (eds.) (2005) *Personification in the Greek World from Antiquity to Byzantium*. London
- Stallbaum, G. (1825–26) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. Leipzig
- Starr, R. J. (1987) "The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world", *CQ* 37: 213–23
- Ste. Croix, G. E. M. de (1961) "Notes on jurisdiction in the Athenian empire", *CQ* 11: 94–112
- (1972) *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London
- Stehle, E. (1994) "Cold meats: Timokreon on Themistokles", *AJP* 115: 507–24
- Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Princeton
- Steiner, D. T. (1994) *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton
- Stengel, P. (1920) *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*, 3rd edn. München
- Stern, E. M. (1997) "Glass and rock crystal: a multifaceted relationship", *JRA* 10: 192–206
- Stewart, A. (1978a) "Lysippan Studies 1. The Only Creator of Beauty", *AJA* 82: 163–71
- (1978b) "Lysippan Studies. 2. Agias and Oilpoured", *AJA* 82: 301–13
- (1978c) "The canon of Polykleitos: a question of evidence", *JHS* 98: 122–31
- (1998) "Nuggets: mining the texts again", *AJA* 102: 271–82
- Stockt, L. van der (ed.) (1996) *Plutarchea Lovaniensia: A Miscellany of Essays on Plutarch*. (Studia Hellenistica 32). Leuven
- Storey, I. (2003) *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford
- Strachey, L. (1918) *Eminent Victorians*. London
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*. Heidelberg. Reprinted in Strasburger (1990), 2.1058–97
- (1986) "Aus dem Anfängen der griechischen Memoirenkunst: Ion von Chios und Stesimbrotos", in Schlink and Sperlich (eds.), 1–11. Reprinted in Strasburger (1990), 3.341–51
- (1990) *Studien zur alten Geschichte*, 3 vols. Hildesheim and New York
- Strubbe, J. H. M. (1984–86) "Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität", *Ancient Society* 15–17: 253–304
- Stuart Jones, H. (1966) *Select Passages from Ancient Writers Illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture*, 2nd edn. Chicago

- Süss, W. (1910) *Ethos: Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik*. Leipzig
- Sutton, D. F. (1984) *The Lost Sophocles*. Lanham MD
- (1989) *Dithyrambographi Graeci*. Hildesheim, München and Zürich
- Svenbro, J. (1992) “‘Ton luth, a quoi bon?’ La lyre et la pierre tombale dans la pensée grecque”, *Méris* 7: 135–60
- (1993) “The child as signifier: the ‘inscription’ of the proper name”, in *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, 64–79. Ithaca and London
- Swaddling, J. (1999) *The Ancient Olympic Games*, 2nd edn. London
- Swain, S. (1989) “Plutarch’s *de Fortuna Romanorum*”, *CQ* 39: 504–16
- (1990) Review of Stadter (1989), *Ploutarchos* 6.2: 76–9
- (1996) *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*. Oxford
- (1997) “Biography and the biographic in the literature of the Roman empire”, in Edwards and Swain (eds.), 1–37
- Syme, R. (1958) *Tacitus*. Oxford
- Tannery, P. (1897) “Orphica, fr. 1 Abel, etc.”, *RPh* 21: 190–5
- Taplin, O. (1986) “Fifth-century tragedy and comedy: a *synkrisis*”, *JHS* 106: 163–74
- (1993) *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Painting*. Oxford
- (1999) “Spreading the word through performance”, in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 33–57
- (ed.) (2000) *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*. Oxford
- Tarán, L. (1965) *Parmenides. A Text with Translation, Commentary, and Critical Essays*. Princeton
- Tarrant, H. (1996) “Orality and Plato’s narrative dialogues”, in Worthington (ed.), 129–47
- Taylor, A. (1970) “The anecdote: a neglected genre”, in Mandel and Rosenberg (eds.), 223–8
- Teçusan, M. (1990) “*Logos sympotikos*: patterns of the irrational in philosophical drinking: Plato outside the *Symposium*”, in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 238–60
- Theodoridis, C. (1979) “Vier neue Bruckstücke des Apollodoros von Athen”, *RhM* 122: 9–17
- Thummer, E. (1968) *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte*, vol. 1. Heidelberg
- Tigerstedt, E. N. (1965) *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*. Stockholm
- Tittmann, J. A. H. (1808) *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon*, 2 vols. Leipzig
- Todd, S. C. (1993) *The Shape of Athenian Law*. Oxford
- Tomlinson, R. A. (1976) *Greek Sanctuaries*. London
- Toynbee, A. J. (1969) *Some Problems of Greek History*. London and Oxford
- Trédé, M. (1992) *Kairos: l’à-propos et l’occasion (le mot et la notion, d’Homère à la fin du IV siècle avant J.-C.)*. Paris
- , Hoffmann, P. and Auvray-Assayas, C. (eds.) (1998) *Le rire des anciens: actes du colloque international*. Paris
- Trendall, A. D. (1967) *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily*. Oxford
- (1983) *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Third Supplement (Consolidated) (BICS Supplement 41)*. London
- (1985) “The Daughters of Anios”, in Böhr and Martini (eds.), 165–8
- (1991) “Farce and tragedy in South Italian vase-painting”, in Rasmussen and Spivey (eds.), 151–82
- and Webster, T. B. L. (1971) *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London
- Troiani, L. and Zecchini, G. (eds.) (2005) *La cultura storica nei primi due secoli dell’impero romano. Milano, 3–5 giugno 2004 (Alle radici della casa comune europea 5)*. Rome
- Trypanis, C. A. (1960) “A new collection of epigrams from Chios”, *Hermes* 88: 69–74
- Turner, E. G. (1980) *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Oxford
- et al. (1962) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXVII*. London

- Tyrrrell, W. B. and Brown, F. S. (1991) *Athenian Myths and Institutions: Words in Action*. New York and Oxford
- Untersteiner, M. (1939) Review of von Blumenthal (1939), *Bollettino di Filologia Classica* 46: 69–71
- Usener, H. (1903) “Dreiheit”, *RhM* 58: 1–47
- and Radermacher, L. (1904) *Dionysii Halicarnasei opuscula*, vol. 6. Leipzig
- Usher, S. (2004) “*Kairos* in fourth-century Greek oratory”, in Edwards and Reid (eds.), 52–61
- Vaio, J. (1971) “Aristophanes’ *Wasps*. The relevance of the final scenes”, *GRBS* 12: 335–51
- Valk, M. van der (1971–87) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*, 4 vols. Leiden
- Vander Waerdt, P. A. (1994b) “Socrates in the Clouds”, in Vander Waerdt (ed.) (1994a), 48–86
- (ed.) (1994a) *The Socratic Movement*. Ithaca and London
- Veneri, A. (1977) “Oinopion e Anacreonte”, *QUCC* 26: 91–8
- Vernant, J.-P. (1983) *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks*. London
- and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1990) *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. New York
- Versnel, H. S. (ed.) (1981) *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2). Leiden
- Veyne, P. (1961) “Vie de Trimalcion”, *Annales E. S. C.* 16: 213–47
- (1988) *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*. Chicago and London
- (1992) *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. London
- Vickers, B. (ed.) (1996) *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Oxford
- Vickers, M. (1990) “Attic symposia after the Persian Wars”, in Murray (ed.) (1990a), 105–21
- (1997) *Pericles on Stage: Political Comedy in Aristophanes’ Early Plays*. Austin
- Vierneisel, K. and Kaeser, B. (eds.) (1990) *Kunst der Schale, Kultur des Trinkens*. Munich
- Vitelli, H. (1897) *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis libros de generatione et corruptione commentaria* (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 14.2). Berlin
- Vlastos, G. (1991) *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher*. Cambridge
- Vogliano, A. (ed.) (1937) *Papyri della R. Università di Milano*, vol. 1, 66–173. Milan
- Vollkommer, R. (1988) *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece*. Oxford
- Vos, M. F. (1986) “Aulodic and auletic contests”, in Brijder, Drukker and Neef (eds.), 121–30
- Wachsmuth, C. and Hense, O. (1884–1912) *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, 5 vols. Berlin
- Wade-Gery, H. T. (1952) *The Poet of the Iliad*. Cambridge
- (1958) *Essays in Greek History*. Oxford
- Waksman, S. (1999) *Instruments of Desire: The Electric Guitar and the Shaping of Musical Experience*. Cambridge MA
- Walbank, F. W. (1967) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 2. Oxford
- Walbank, M. B. (1978) *Athenian Proxemies of the Fifth Century BC*. Toronto
- Walker, H. J. (1995) *Theseus and Athens*. Oxford
- Walker, S. and Cameron, A. (eds.) (1989) *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium (BICS Supplement 55)*. London
- Wallace, R. (1995) “Speech, song and text, public and private. Evolutions in communications media and fora in fourth-century Athens”, in Eder (ed.), 199–217
- (2004) “Damon of Oa: a music theorist ostracized?”, in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 249–68
- Walsh, G. B. (1984) *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry*. Chapel Hill
- Ward, A. G. (ed.) (1970) *The Quest for Theseus*. London

- Warren, J. (forthcoming) "Diogenes Laertius: biographer of philosophy", in König and Whitmarsh (eds.)
- Waterfield, R. (1998) *Plutarch. Greek Lives: A Selection of Nine Greek Lives, with Introductions and Notes by Philip A. Stadter*. Oxford
- Webster, T. B. L. (1936) "Sophocles and Ion of Chios", *Hermes* 71: 263–74
- (1954) "Personification as a mode of Greek thought", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17: 10–21
- (1964a) *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London
- (1964b) *From Mycenae to Homer*, 2nd edn. London
- (1967) *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*. London
- Wehrli, F. (1959) *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar. X: Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler. Rückblick: der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit*. Basel and Stuttgart
- (1967) *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar. II: Aristoxenus*, 2nd edn. Basel
- (1973) "Gnome, Anekdoten und Biographie", *Museum Helveticum* 30: 193–208
- Weinberg, G. D. and McClellan, M. C. (1992) *Glass Vessels in Ancient Greece. Their History Illustrated from the Collection of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens*. Athens
- Welcker, F. G. (1836) "Anzeigen", *RhM* 4: 424–51
- (1839) *Die griechische Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus*, 3 vols. Bonn
- Wendel, C. (1958) *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera (editio altera ex editione anni MCMXXXV Lucis Ope expressa)*. Berlin
- (1958) *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*. Berlin
- Wesoly, M. (1990) "'Lira dalle undici corde': per l'interpretazione del fr. 5 G.-P. di Ione di Chio", *AION* 12: 89–98
- West, M. L. (1965) "The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros", *JHS* 85: 149–59
- (1971a) *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford
- (1971b) "Stesichorus", *CQ* 21: 302–14
- (1972) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Oxford
- (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14). Berlin and New York
- (1980) *Delectus ex Iambis et Elegis Graecis*. Oxford
- (1983a) "Two lunatic notes", *ΣPE* 50: 46
- (1983b) "Tragica, VT", *BICS* 30: 63–82
- (1983c) *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford
- (1985) "Ion of Chios", *BICS* 32: 71–8
- (1989) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. 1, 2nd edn. Oxford
- (1992a) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, vol. 2, 2nd edn. Oxford
- (1992b) *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford
- (1992c) "Analecta musica", *ΣPE* 92: 1–54
- (1993) "Simonides redivivus", *ΣPE* 98: 9–11
- (1999) "The invention of Homer", *CQ* 49: 364–82
- (2002) "'Eumelos': a Corinthian epic cycle?", *JHS* 122: 109–33
- Westerink, L. G. (1956) *Olympiodorus: Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*. Amsterdam
- Westermann, W. L. (1955) *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia
- Whitby, M. (1998) "An international symposium? Ion of Chios fr. 27 and the margins of the Delian league", in Dabrowa (ed.), 207–24
- Whitman, C. H. (1964) *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Martin Classical Lectures 19). Cambridge MA
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001) "'Greece is the World': exile and identity in the Second Sophistic", in Goldhill (ed.) (2001a), 269–305
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1876) "In libellum ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ coniectanea", *Hermes* 10: 334–46
- (1880) *Aus Kydathen* (Philologische Untersuchungen 1). Berlin
- (1902) "Lese Früchte. LXXII–LXXXV", *Hermes* 37: 302–14

- (1903) *Timotheos. Die Perser. Aus einem Papyrus von Abusir im Auftrage der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*. Leipzig. Reprinted with Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1903) *Der Timotheos-Papyrus gefunden bei Abusir am 1. Februar 1902: Lichtdruck-Ausgabe* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft 3). Hildesheim, 1973
- (1927) “Lesefrüchte. CCXVIII–CCXXX”, *Hermes* 62: 276–98
- (1932) *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. 2. Berlin
- Williams, B. (2002) *The Life and World of Aristotle*. Oxford
- Williams, C. J. F. (1999) *Philoponus on Aristotle's On Coming-To-Be and Perishing 1.6–2.4*. London
- Willis, W. H. (1958) “Greek literary papyri from Egypt and the classical canon”, *Harvard Library Bulletin* 12: 5–34
- (1968) “A census of the literary papyri from Egypt”, *GRBS* 9: 205–41
- Wilson, J. R. (1980) “Kairos as ‘due measure’”, *Glotta* 58: 177–204
- (1981) “Kairos as ‘profit’”, *CQ* 31: 418–20
- Wilson, N. G. (1967) “The libraries of the Byzantine World”, *GRBS* 8: 53–80
- Wilson, P. (1997) “Leading the tragic chorus: tragic prestige in the democratic city”, in Pelling (ed.) (1997b), 81–108
- (1999) “The aulos in Athens”, in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 58–95
- (2000a) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge
- (2000b) “Powers of horror and laughter: the great age of drama”, in Taplin (ed.), 88–132
- (2002) Review of Lavecchia (2000), *BCMR* 2002.04.24
- (2003) “The sound of cultural conflict: Kritias and the culture of *mousiké* in Athens”, in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.) (2003a), 181–206
- (2004a) “Athenian strings”, in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 269–306
- (2004b) Review of Iannucci (2002), *BCMR* 2004.09.16
- Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. I. (eds.) (1990) *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton
- Wiseman, T. P. (1988) “Satyrs in Rome? The background to Horace's *Ars Poetica*”, *JRS* 78: 1–13
- (2002b) “Ovid and the stage”, in Herbert-Brown (ed.), 275–99
- (ed.) (2002a) *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford
- Wöhrlé, G. and Fortenbaugh, W. W. (eds.) (2002) *On the Opuscula of Theophrastus. Akten der 3. Tagung der Karl-und-Gertrud-Abel-Stiftung vom 19.–23. Juli 1999 in Trier*. Stuttgart
- Woodbury, L. (1971) “Socrates and Archelaus”, *Phoenix* 25: 299–309
- Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London and Sydney
- Woolf, G. (1994) “Becoming Roman, staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East”, *PCPS* 40: 116–43
- Worman, N. (1997) “The body as argument: Helen in four Greek texts”, *Classical Antiquity* 16: 151–203
- Worthington, I. (ed.) (1996) *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 157). Leiden, New York and Köln
- Wycheley, R. E. (1962) *How the Greeks Built Cities*, 2nd edn. New York
- Wyss, B. (1936) *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*. Berlin
- Yalouris, E. (1976) *The Archaeology and Early History of Chios*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Oxford
- Yalouris, N. (1982) “The importance and prestige of the Games”, in *The Olympic Games in Ancient Greece: Ancient Olympia and the Olympic Games*. Athens, 77–81 (Greek original 1976)
- Zadorojnyi, A. V. (1997) “Tragedy and epic in Plutarch's *Crassus*”, *Hermes* 125: 169–82
- Ziegler, K. (1994) *Plutarch. Fünf Doppelbiographien*, 2 vols. Zürich

- Ziehen, L. (1939) "Olympia II. Kulte", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 18.1, 48–71. Stuttgart
- Zimmermann, B. (1983) "Utopisches und Utopie in den Komödien des Aristophanes", *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 9: 57–77
- (1997) "Ion. Geb. um 480 v. Chr. auf Chios; gest. vor 421 v. Chr. vermutl. in Athen", in Schütze, O. (ed.) (1997) *Metzler Lexikon Antiker Autoren*, 362. Stuttgart and Weimar
- (1998) "Ion aus Chios", in Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 5, 1075–6. Stuttgart and Weimar
- Zolotas, G. I. (1921–28) *Ἱστορία τῆς Χίου*, 5 vols. Athens

CONCORDANCE TO THE FRAGMENTS OF ION OF CHIOS

The Concordance lists fragments of Ion referred to in this volume. A more comprehensive concordance is provided by Leurini 2000a, 2000b.

TESTIMONIA

Leurini	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
T4	T1	T1	A3			<i>Suda</i> s.v. Ion Chios (ι 487)
T6	T6					Argum. in Eur. <i>Hipp.</i> 2 = <i>TrGF</i> DID C 13
T7		T2a	A2		745	Ar. <i>Pax</i> 832–7
T8	T2	T2b, T3	A2	p. 79		Schol. Ar. <i>Pax</i> 835
T9a	T3		A1			Harpocr. s.v. Ion
T9b	F25c		B2			<i>Suda</i> s.v. Orpheus (ο 654)
T10						Phot. ι 287; <i>Suda</i> s.v. Ion (ι 489)
T11						<i>Suda</i> s.v. <i>dithyrambodidaskaloi</i> (δ 1029)
T12		T3				Ath. 3f; <i>Suda</i> α 731
T13						Ath. 436f
T14	T7					Thuc. 8.38.3
T15a						Callim. <i>Iamb.</i> 13.43–9 (fr. 203 Pfeiffer)
T15b						<i>Diegesis</i> 9.32–38 in Callim. <i>Iamb.</i> 13 (fr. 203 Pfeiffer)
T16	T4					Strabo 14.1.35
T17		T6	A4			[Longinus] <i>Subl.</i> 33.5
T18						Tzetz. in Lyc. <i>Alex.</i> 2 = <i>TrGF</i> CAT A2

(cont.)

Leurini	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
T19						Tab. Montefalconii 3 = <i>TrGF</i> CAT A3
T20						D. L. 4.31 = Arcesilaus
T21a	T8			31		Ath. 436f = Baton of Sinope <i>FGrH</i> 268 F6 [= 94 Leurini]
T21b						Ael. <i>VH</i> 2.41 = Baton of Sinope
T22a						Callim. fr. 449 Pfeiffer = Epigenes [= T9a Leurini]
T22b		F1				Ath. 468c = Epigenes [= 1 Leurini]
T24						Callim. fr. 449 Pfeiffer [= T9a Leurini]
T25a					743	Miller <i>Mélanges</i> 361–2; Zenob. Ath. 2.35 [4.270 Bühler] = Mnaseas [= 88 Leurini]
T25b		F17a				Gramm. Ign. <i>POxy</i> 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127) = Mnaseas [= 22 Leurini]
T26						Ath. 634c = Aristarchus <i>On Ion's Omphale</i> [= 26b Leurini]
T27		F13				Hsch. κ 4426 = Callistratus [= 16 Leurini]
T28		F1				Ath. 468de = Philemon [= 1 Leurini]
T29	T3		A1			Harpocration s.v. Ion = Demetrius of Scepsis [= T9a Leurini]
T30						Ath. 495ab = Crates [= 13 Leurini]
T31a						Ath. 468d = Didymus <i>On Ion's Agamemnon</i> [= 1 Leurini]
T31b						Ath. 634e = Didymus <i>Counter-explanations on Ion</i> [= 26b Leurini]
T32	T3		A1			Harpocration s.v. Ion = Apollonides of Nicaea [= T9a Leurini].

FRAGMENTS

Leurini	Work	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
1	<i>Agamemnon</i>		F1				Ath. 468c; Eust. 1300.4–5; Hsch. δ 145
2	<i>Agamemnon</i>		F2				Stob. 4.52.36 W-H
7	<i>Alcmene</i>		F6				Hsch. κ 1495
8	<i>Alcmene</i>		F7				Pollux 10.92; Phot. 495.21
11	<i>Argeioi</i>		F9				Hsch. σ 224
13	<i>Eurytidai</i>		F10				Ath. 495ab
16	<i>Eurytidai</i>		F13				Hsch. κ 4426
18	<i>Laertes</i>		F14				Ath. 267d
19	<i>Mega Drama</i>		F15				Pollux 10.177
20	<i>Mega Drama</i>		F16				Hsch. μ 621
21	<i>Mega Drama</i>		F17				Hsch. ο 922; Phot. 339.12
22	<i>Omphale</i>		F17a				Gramm. Ign. <i>POxy</i> 13. 1611 (fr. 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127)
23	<i>Omphale</i>		F18				Strabo 1.3.19; Eust. in Dion. Per. 476; Plin. <i>NH</i> 4.63
24	<i>Omphale</i>		F19				Hsch. σ 1515
25	<i>Omphale</i>		F20				Ath. 501f; Eust. 1261.24; Hsch. μ 923; Pollux 6.98
26a	<i>Omphale</i>		F22				Ath. 634ef
26b	<i>Omphale</i>		F23				Ath. 634ce; Hsch. μ 3
27	<i>Omphale</i>		F24				Ath. 690b
28	<i>Omphale</i>		F25				Ar. Byz. fr. 23 A-C Slater <i>ap.</i> Eust. 1761. 31; Pollux 5.101; Schol. Hom. Θ 545 (<i>Anecdota Parisina</i> 3.46.6–8 Cramer); Hdn. 2.767.20 Lentz; Choerob. <i>Gr. Gr.</i> 4.1.344.2.
29*	<i>Omphale</i>	F18	F*30				Pollux 2.95; Tzetz. <i>Chil.</i> 3.957–8
30	<i>Omphale</i>		F28				Phot. ε 2224; <i>Et. Gen.</i> s.v. εὔκηλον; Hsch. ε 6925

(cont.)

Leurini	Work	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
31	<i>Omphale</i>		F29				Ath. 411b; Eust. 870.12, 1817.18
32	<i>Omphale</i>		F26				Ath. 498e; Eust. 1775.19
33	<i>Omphale</i>		F27				<i>Et. Gen.</i> s.v. $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\iota$; <i>Et. M.</i> 671.41 Gaisford
34	<i>Omphale</i>		F31				Hsch. ϵ 6050, ϵ 5919; Phot. ϵ 1967; cf. Leurini (2000a) <i>ad loc.</i>
35	<i>Omphale</i>		F32				Harpocr. s.v. $\theta\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\omicron\varsigma$; Phot. θ 180; Suda θ 380; [Zonar.] <i>Lex.</i> p. 1045 Tittmann
36	<i>Omphale</i>		F33				Schol. Ar. <i>Birds</i> 1680; Hdn. 1.25.18 Lentz
37*	<i>Omphale</i>		F33a				Gramm. Ign. <i>POxy</i> 13.1611 (fr. 16)
38	<i>Omphale</i>		F21				Ath. 258f
41	<i>Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]</i>		F41				Ar. <i>Frogs</i> 706 and Schol.
42	<i>Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]</i>		F39				Ath. 184f–185a; Eust. 1479.27
43	<i>Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]</i>		F40				Ath. 451d; Eust. 865.15
44	<i>Phoenix or Kaineus [or Oineus]</i>		F38				Ath. 91d; Zenob. 5.68 <i>CPG</i> ; Apostolius 2.8a <i>CPG</i> ; Schol. Hom. O 714 (<i>Anecdota Parisina</i> 3.387. 10ff. Cramer); Plut. <i>De soll. an.</i> 971f; Diogenianus 7.83b <i>CPG</i>
45	<i>Phoenix 1</i>		F36				Ath. 318e; Eust. 1541.43
48	<i>Phoenix 1</i>		F41b				Phot. α 1294
49	<i>Phoenix 2</i>		F42				Ath. 185a
p. 35	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F**43a				Procl. <i>Chrest.</i> (Allen 5.107. 4–7)
51	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F43b				Hdn. fr. 24 Hunger
52	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F43c				Hdn. fr. 25 Hunger

(cont.)

Leurini	Work	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
53	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F44				Ar. <i>Frogs</i> 1425 and Schol.; Suda σ 371
54	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F45				Ath. 185a
55	<i>Phrouroi</i>		F46				Hsch. v 601; Phot. 301.7
60*	tragedy		F50				Ath. 21a; Eust. 1942.4
61*	tragedy		F51				Ath. 478b
63*	tragedy		F53			746	Philo <i>Quod omn. prob.</i> 134
68*	tragedy	F10	F53f	B3b			Phot. α 3262
69*	tragedy		F54				[Plut.] <i>Cons. ad Apoll.</i> 113b
70ab*	tragedy		FF58, 55				Plut. <i>Dem.</i> 3.2; <i>Cons. ad Apoll.</i> 116d; Olympiod. in Plat. <i>Alc.</i> 129a (201, p. 126 Westerink); Schol. Plat. <i>Alc.</i> 129a
71*	tragedy		F56				Plut. <i>De tranq. anim.</i> 466d; Stob. 3.4.116 W-H; cf. Liban. <i>Or.</i> 1.142
72*	tragedy		F57				Plut. <i>Quaest. conv.</i> 658c; <i>Fac. in orbe lun.</i> 929a
73*	<i>Omphale?</i>		F59				Pollux 7.60
83	dithyramb					740	Sallustius <i>Argum. in Soph. Ant.</i>
84	dithyramb					745	Ar. <i>Pax</i> 835–7 and Schol.; Suda δ 1029; cf. TT7–8 Leurini
86*	melic					744	Ath. 35de
87	<i>Hymn to Kairos</i>					742	Paus. 5.14.9
88	<i>Encomium to Skythiades</i>					743	Miller <i>Mélanges</i> 361–2 (Zenob. Ath. 2.35 [4.270 Bühler]; cf. Zenob. 1.48 <i>CPG</i>); Phot. 617.23; Suda υ 108; Paus. Att. υ 5 Erbse
89	elegy					26	Ath. 447d
90	elegy	T5c				27	Ath. 463ac, 496c
91	elegy					28	Ath. 68b; Choerob. <i>ap. Et. Gen.</i> s.v. ὀρίγανον
92	elegy			B4	30		D. L. 1.120

(cont.)

Leurini	Work	FGrH 392	TrGF 19	DK 36	West IEG ²	PMG	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
93	elegy			B5	32		Cleonid. <i>Isag. harm.</i> 12, p. 202 Jan; Euclid. 8, 216 Menge; Manuel Bryennius <i>Harmonica</i> p. 116 Jonker
94	elegy	T8				31	Ath. 436f; Ael. <i>VH</i> 2.41
95*	elegy		F66a			30A	Philodem. <i>De piet. (PHerc</i> 243 VI 3–12) p. 13 Gomperz
96*	<i>Chiou Ktisis</i> / elegy					29	Plut. <i>Thes.</i> 20.2 [= 7 G.-P]
97	<i>Chiou Ktisis</i>	F3					<i>Etym. Or.</i> s.v. λόγχη
98	<i>Chiou Ktisis</i>	F1					Paus. 7.4.8–10
99	<i>Chiou Ktisis</i>	F2					Ath. 426e
100	<i>Epidemiai</i>						Iohan. Alex. <i>Comm. in Hippoc. Epid.</i> 6, part. 1.120a69–b2
101	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F7	T4c				Schol. M Aesch. <i>Pers.</i> 432
102	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F5					Ath. 107a
103	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F4					Ath. 93a
104	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F6					Ath. 603e–604d
105*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F12					Plut. <i>Cim.</i> 5.3
106*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F13					Plut. <i>Cim.</i> 9.1–6
107*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F14					Plut. <i>Cim.</i> 16.8–10
108*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F22	Aesch. T149ab				Plut. <i>De prof. virt.</i> 79de, <i>Quomodo adul.</i> 29f; Stob. 3.29.89 W-H.
109*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F15					Plut. <i>Per.</i> 5.3
110*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F16					Plut. <i>Per.</i> 28.7
111*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F9					D. L. 2.23
112*	<i>Epidemiai</i>	F11					Phot. α 466; <i>Suda</i> α 729
113	<i>Sunekdemetikos</i>	F8					Pollux 2.88
114	<i>Triagmos</i>	F24ab		A6, B1			Harpocr. s.v. Ion; Isoc. <i>Antid.</i> 268
115* (I)	<i>Triagmos</i>	F24c		A6			Philop. <i>De gen. et corr.</i> 329a1, p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli

(cont.)

Leurini	Work	<i>FGrH</i> 392	<i>TrGF</i> 19	DK 36	West <i>IEG</i> ²	<i>PMG</i>	PRIMARY REFERENCE/S
115* (II)	<i>Triagmos</i>						Philop. <i>De gen. et corr.</i> 330b17, p. 227, 13–4 Vitelli
116 (I)	<i>Triagmos</i>	F25b		B2			Clem. Al. <i>Str.</i> 1.131
116 (II)	<i>Triagmos</i>	F25a		B2			D. L. 8.8
117*	<i>Triagmos</i>	F26		A7			Aët. <i>Plac.</i> 2.25.11 (<i>Dox. Gr.</i> 356b21); Stob. 1.26.1 W-H.
118*	<i>Triagmos</i>	F17ab		B3			Plut. <i>De fort. Rom.</i> 316d; <i>Quaest. conv.</i> 717b
119	prose	F20		B3a			Varro <i>Ling.</i> fr 46 Goetz- Schoell
120	tragedy or hymn		F53c				Phot. α 1304 Th.
121	elegy or tragedy		F53dd		32A		Phot. α 2304 Th. [= 10 G-P]
123	tragedy		F62				Schol. Verg. <i>G.</i> 1.482
125	prose?	F21					Phryn. <i>Ecl.</i> 286 Fischer
128**	<i>Khisis?</i>	cf. 395 F1					Ael. <i>HA</i> 16.39
129**	<i>Epidemiai?</i>	F23					<i>Vita Sophoclea</i> 20 = <i>TrGF</i> Soph. T1
138***	[epigram]		T[8]				Ion of Samos <i>ap. AP</i> 7.43
139***	[epigram]						[Ion] <i>ap. AP</i> 7.44
140***	[Eion epigrams]						Aeschin. <i>Ctesiph.</i> 183–5; Plut. <i>Cim.</i> 7.4–5
141***	spurious						Ath. 638a
151***	satyr play						<i>POxy</i> 1083 + 2453 = <i>TrGF</i> Soph. FF **1130–1133
152***	tragedy						<i>POxy</i> 2382 = <i>TrGF</i> Adesp. F664
153***	[Coronea epigram]						<i>IG</i> I ³ 1163.34–41
154g***	<i>Spuria</i> [epigram]						Chios Museum Inv. 677 (<i>SEG</i> 16.497)

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

Achaeus (<i>TrGF</i> 20)		<i>Choephoroi</i>	
<i>Aithon</i> F10	287n17	167	209
<i>Omphale</i> F35	290	<i>Epigonoï</i>	248n21
Achilles Tatius 2.6.1–3	291n39	<i>Eumenides</i>	
Adespota elegiaca		686	149n48
23 West	337n29	<i>Persae</i>	
27.8 West	239n79	407	344n70
Adespota lyrica		<i>Prometheus Pyrkaeus</i>	
11 = <i>Cassandrae Oracula ap. Collectanea</i>		F204b**.12	280n35
<i>Alexandrina</i>		364ff.	150n54
(pp. 188–90)	334n11	<i>Triptolemus</i>	280n35
19 = <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i>		F300.7	280n35
(p. 191)	231n40	Schol. <i>Persae</i>	
20 = <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i>		42	287n17
(pp. 191–2)	231n40	Schol. M <i>Persae</i>	
Adespota tragica		432	2n8, 35n37,
<i>TrGF</i> F664	3n12, 47n11		56n42, 90n58
Aelian		Aëtius	
<i>Historia animalium</i>		<i>Placita</i>	
16.39	139n1, 170n48	1.3.20	60n58
<i>Varia historia</i>		2.20.12	309
2.41	10n45, 11n45,	2.25.11	60n55,
	48, 72n32,		308,
	119n27, 132,		315n46,
	145n29, 174,		342n53
	223n15, 234,	Alcaeus (Lobel-Page)	
	244n5, 269,	F 119	233
	316n53	F 333	236
12.43	130n62	F 335	235n59
Aeschines		F 355	257n50
<i>Against Ctesiphon</i>		F 366	227
183–5	2n7, 341n51	Alcidamas	
<i>On the Embassy</i>		<i>Odysseus: Against Palamedes for</i>	
31	141n4	<i>Treason</i>	145n29
Schol. <i>Against Timarchus</i>		§20 Blass	
128–30	345n75	Alexander Rhetor	
Aeschylus		<i>De figuris</i>	
<i>Agamemnon</i>		19.14	334n11
100–1	289	Allatios, L. <i>Hellas</i>	70–1
171–2	314	Anacreon	
358f.	259n60	F eleg. 2 West	220n5
1050–1	209	142 Gentili	143n16
<i>Amymone</i>		505e <i>PMG</i>	144n23, 147n36
F14	287n17		

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
| Anastasia the Martyr | | Schol. <i>Argonautica</i> | |
| <i>To Chrysogonus</i> | 32n34 | 3.997–1004a Wendel | 145n28, |
| Andron of Ephesus | | | 147n35, |
| <i>Tripod</i> | 313, 315 | | 147n36 |
| <i>Anecdota Parisina</i> (Cramer) | | <i>Khiseis Alexandreias, Kaunou, Knidou, Naukrateos,</i> | |
| 3.46.6–8 | 48n15, 277, | <i>Rhodon = Collectanea Alexandrina</i> | |
| | 287n18 | 4–12 (pp. 5–8) | 247n17 |
| 3.387.10ff. | 386 | Apollonius Sophista | |
| <i>Anthologia Palatina</i> | | <i>Lexicon Homericum</i> | |
| 6.43.1 | 101n88 | 93 l.1 | 96n72 |
| 7.43 | 337n24 | Apostolius 2.8a <i>CPG</i> | 386 |
| 7.44 | 337n24 | Archilochus | |
| 9.823.4 | 101n88 | 2 West | 244n7 |
| 10.52 | 333n10, | 126 West | 249n25 |
| | 344n70 | 201 West | 317n55 |
| 12.31 | 344n70 | 205 West | 103n92 |
| 14.14 | 201n83 | 286–288 West | 151n64 |
| 16.275 | 344n70 | | |
| Antimachus F 32 Wyss | 333n9 | Aristarchus <i>ap.</i> | |
| Antiphanes (<i>PCG</i>) | | Athenaeus 634ce | 31, 248n20, |
| F122 | 231 | | 282 |
| <i>Omphale</i> | | Aristides | |
| FF174–176 | 291 | <i>Orationes</i> | |
| | | 26.31 | 199 |
| Antiphon | | Aristides Quintilianus | |
| 5.69–70 | 122n41 | <i>De musica</i> | |
| 87B44c DK, | | 2.15.85 | 197n67 |
| col. 1.1–30 | 239n78 | 2.16 | 187 |
| Apollodorus | | Aristophanes | |
| <i>Bibliotheca</i> | | <i>Aves</i> | |
| 1.7.3 | 143n18 | 877–79 | 159 |
| 1.8.1 | 151n58, | 880 | 68n20, 159 |
| | 151n59 | <i>Daitales</i> | |
| 1.9.16 | 147n35 | F233 | 258n57 |
| 2.6.3 | 283n3, 284, | <i>Ecclesiastusae</i> | |
| | 285 | 883 | 195n60 |
| 2.7.8 | 283 | 890–9 | 195n60 |
| 3.12.7 | 141n8 | 911–8 | 195n60 |
| <i>Epitome</i> | | <i>Equites</i> | |
| 1.9 | 145n28, | 326 | 234 |
| | 147n35, | 520–23 | 195n57 |
| | 147n36 | 635 | 101n86 |
| 3.10 | 145n26 | 697 | 101n86, |
| 5.13 | 250n27 | | 185n23 |
| Apollonides of Nicaea <i>ap.</i> | | 989–90 | 184n17, |
| Harpocration s.v. Ion | 31, 49n15, 298, | | 187n29 |
| | 312 | <i>Lysistrata</i> | |
| Apollonius Rhodius | | 1138–41 | 94 |
| <i>Argonautica</i> | | 1144 | 97n75 |
| 3.358ff. | 144n22 | <i>Nubes</i> | |
| 3.360 | 143n18 | 273 | 257, 257n50 |
| 4.1343 | 258n58 | 638ff. | 203n90 |
| | | 970–2 | 192 |

1350	194		10n41, 18n6,
1357-8	199		22, 32, 34,
<i>Pax</i>			45n1, 77,
169-72	167		78n11, 79n17,
828-31	83n30		83n30, 95n68,
829	32		119n30,
831	33n36		145n29,
832-5	283		234, 243n1,
832-7	2n11, 46n3,		246n15, 270,
	266, 342		298n8, 298n9,
834-7	24		312, 312n42,
835	2, 33, 34		333n8,
835-7	83n30, 167		339n35,
839-41	83n30		339n37, 342,
<i>Plutus</i>			342n54,
168	197n65		345n77
279	101n86	Schol. <i>Plutus</i>	
<i>Ranae</i>		279	101n86,
52-3	46n5		185n23
516	197	Schol. <i>Ranae</i>	
706	266	83-4	79n17
786-94	266	706	266n1
788	266	1425	250, 266n1
952	185n23		
1027	204	Aristophanes of Byzantium F 23 A-C	
1071-2	185n23	Slater	48n15, 277,
1301ff.	196n60,		287n18
	199n74	Aristotle	
1305ff.	199	[<i>Athenaion Politeia</i>]	
1387	101n88	21.6	152n67
1425	250, 266	26.1	124n46
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>		27.1	133
170	195n60	27.3	122
<i>Triphales</i>		28.3-4	127n55
F556	166	<i>De caelo</i>	
<i>Vespae</i>		268a7-9	302
7	211n17	268a10-12	302
80	11n45	268a11	302
446	235n55	268a13	313
1186-7	115n15	268a14	303
Schol. <i>Aves</i>		268a16-18	303n23
880	160	<i>De generatione et corruptione</i>	
1680	209, 209n12	329a1	60n58
Schol. <i>Equites</i>		330b17	60n58
697	101n86	<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>	
Schol. <i>Nubes</i>		1145a27	83n31
96	193n52	<i>Historia animalium</i>	
361	79n14	614a22	313
859	135n73	<i>Metaphysica</i>	
970	192n47	985b23ff.	341n47
Schol. <i>Pax</i>		1078b21	341n47
171	166n35	1081a34	313
697	173n61	1081b12	313
835	2n10, 3n13,	[<i>Oeconomica</i>]	
	3n16, 9n39,	2.23	121n37

<i>Physica</i>		184d	185n22
4.9	306	184f–185a	210, 333n8
<i>Poetica</i>		185a	210, 252, 272n21
1457b6–24	210n15	258f	279, 286
1458a20ff.	232	267d	209
1459a5ff.	232	277d	255n43
1459b4–6	255n43	318e	43, 249n24
<i>Politica</i>		411b	278, 286,
1252b	59n49		309n34,
1279b17–19	121n38		339n39
1284a38	226	425b4	236
1285a	220	426e	4n18, 5n21,
1299b38ff.	122		31n32, 50,
1317b34ff.	122		69n25, 139,
1329a18–21	121n38		144, 145,
1341a	192		145n29, 154,
1341a31–2	195		170n48
1342a19–21	192n48	436f	10n45, 31, 48,
[<i>Problemata</i>]			72n32,
19.48	187n29		119n27, 132,
<i>Rhetorica</i>			145n29, 174,
1367a32–3	192n48		223n15, 234,
1375b	141n7		244n5, 269,
1388b22	87n51		316n53
1394a37ff.	231n39	445ef	219
<i>Topica</i>		446b	309n34
100a20ff.	302n21	447d	69, 69n27,
105b15ff.	60n58		182n12, 198,
Aristoxenus			202, 211, 218,
F 97 Wehrli	195		304n25, 343
F 102 Wehrli	181n9	448b ff.	231
		448b–9b	231n40
		451d	210
Asius of Samos F 7 <i>EGF</i>	151n65	452d	307
Athenaeus		462cf	220n5
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		462ff8	220
1b	38n39	463ac	8n34, 50n21,
3e	304n25		120, 153n73,
3f	2n10, 10n41,		174n64,
	38, 45n1, 234,		182n12, 185,
	243, 271,		221, 270,
	339n37		333n8, 337n29
5e	304n25	468c	31, 48n15,
21a	209		259, 310n35
29e	244n6	468d	31, 48n14
35a–40f	238	468de	48n15, 52n31,
35de	11n46, 212,		259n61
	237n71,	478b	310n35
	309n34	495ab	48n15, 49n15, 269
68b	70	496c	8n34, 50n21, 120,
91d	43, 249n24,		174n64, 182n12,
	317		185, 221, 270,
93a	35n37, 95n68		333n8, 337n29
107a	35n37	498e	278, 287

500f-1d	260n62	436f	10n45, 31, 48,
501f	277, 288n22,		72n32, 119n27,
	310n35		145n29, 244n5,
505de	337n24		316n53
515e-6c	290n33	Boethius	
589de	85n39	<i>De Musica</i>	
602c	203	1.1	187n31
603	22	Callimachus	
603e	23, 35n37	<i>Hekale</i>	
603e-604d	5n26, 10n43,	F 233 Pfeiffer	248n20
	56n42, 68n22,	F 242 Pfeiffer	248n20
	77n5, 82, 90n58,	F 342 Pfeiffer	248n20
	108, 111, 117, 172,	<i>Iambi</i> (F 203)	
	172n57, 173,	13.30-33	40
	184n20, 215n27,	13.43	41
	227, 256n46,	13.43-9	1n3, 40-1, 48,
	265n74, 267, 268,		58n49, 78n12
	309n34, 321n8,	13.44	41
	337n29	13.45	41
603f	173	13.47	41
604d	173	13.48f.	41
605e	22	F 449 Pfeiffer	30n31, 48n15,
618c	185		316n51
620d	338n33	<i>Diegesis</i> [to <i>Iamb</i> 13]	
625c	196n60	9.32-8	1n3, 40, 48, 58n49,
634c	31, 248n20		78n12, 246n13,
634ce	48n15, 197n64,		316n51
	272, 288, 333n8	Callistratus <i>ap.</i> Hesychius κ	
634cf	282	4426	49n15
634e	31, 48n14	Callistratus	
634ef	197, 272, 283,	<i>Descriptions</i>	
	286, 288n23,	6	344n70
	333n8	<i>Cassandrae Oracula</i>	
638a	337n24	11 (<i>ap. Collectanea Alexandrina</i> ,	
690b	225, 277, 287,	pp. 188-90)	334n11
	287n17, 309n34	Chamaeleon of Heraclea <i>ap.</i> Athenaeus	
epit. 1.4	39	184d	185n22
Augustine		Choeroboscus	
<i>Epistulae</i>		<i>ap. Etymologicum Genuinum</i>	
118.9	63n65	s.v. ὀρίγων	70, 270
Ausonius		<i>ap. Grammatici Graeci</i>	
<i>Epigrammata</i>		4.1.344.2 Hilgard	48n15, 277,
33.10	344n70		287n18
Bacchylides		Choirilos of Samos	
5.165-73	151n58	<i>Persika</i>	247n17
10.18	153	Cicero	
17.14	141n10	<i>De legibus</i>	
17.20-46	148n46	2.39	187n31
20B Maehler	183n14	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>	
20C 1-2 Maehler	183n14	1.20.7	62n64
Baton of Sinope		2.1.12	62n64
<i>FGrH</i> 268 F6: <i>On Ion the Poet, ap.</i>			
Athenaeus			

16.11.2	56n39	Didymus	
<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i> 1.4	184n17	<i>Counterexplanations on Ion ap.</i>	
Clearchus F 43a Wehrli	290n33	Athenaeus 634ce	31, 48n14, 283
Clement of Alexandria		<i>On Ion's Agamemnon ap.</i>	
<i>Stromateis</i>		Athenaeus 468de	31, 48n14, 259
1.21.129	313	Dinarchus	
1.131	30, 60, 301, 306, 315, 340	<i>Against Demosthenes</i>	
		91.1	229
Cleobulina 3 West	201n83	Dio Chrysostom	
Cleonides		<i>Orationes</i>	
<i>Isagoge harmonike</i>		33.57	187n31
12, p. 202 Jan	9n38, 59n51, 180, 272, 341	Diodorus Siculus	
Crates <i>ap.</i> Athenaeus		4.31.5–8	283n3
495ab	48n15	4.36.2	151n64
Cratinus (<i>PCG</i>)		5.62.1–2	145n28
<i>Boukoloi</i>		5.79.1	146n32, 147n36, 150n57
F20	196n63	5.79.2	145n28, 147n35
<i>Cheirones</i>		5.84.3	146n32
F259	290, 290n32	11.50.4	95n70
<i>Horai</i>		11.64.2	97n75
F276	196	12.38–41.1	84n37
<i>Malthakoi</i>		14.109	338n33
F104	197	Diogenes of Apollonia	
Cratinus the Younger		64A4 DK	298n10
<i>Omphale</i>		64B1 DK	299
F5 <i>PCG</i>	291, 291n37	64B2 DK	300
<i>Cretan Hymn to the Kouros</i>	334n15	Diogenes Laertius	
Critias		<i>Lives of the Greek Philosophers</i>	
2 West	146n32, 202	1.12	322n14
4 West	203	1.14	325
<i>Homilae</i>	324	1.18	326
<i>Cypria</i>		1.30	313
F 19 <i>EGF</i>	145n27	1.79	336n20
Demetrius of Sceptis <i>ap.</i>		1.116	300n15
Harpocraton s.v. Ion	31, 49n15, 298, 312	1.120	5n26, 10n42, 59n51, 200, 270, 301, 305, 306, 323n16, 340
Democritus		2.1–2	300n15
<i>Aitiaí peri akairion kai epikairion</i>	337n25	2.23	5n26, 6, 20n14, 35n37, 77n6, 120n34, 319, 321, 321n8, 323, 325, 338n32
Demosthenes			326n32
1.2	334n11	4.29	48n13, 327n33
30.10–11	46n4	4.31	
60.9	140n3		
60.30	152		
Dictys of Crete 1.23	145n26		

4.32	48n13		238n73,
5.88	55n39		304n25
8.1	328	F103.8 Inwood	211n17
8.2	326n32	F113/126 Inwood	209
8.6	306		
8.8	60, 301,	Ephorus <i>FGrH</i> 70	
	322n14,	F193	135n73
	323n16, 340	F196	84n37
		F236	107n102
8.63	338n33		
9.1	340n46	Epicurus	
9.5	300n15	<i>Epistula ad Herodotum ap.</i>	
9.20	247n17	D. L. 10.78	298n10
9.35	326n32		
9.52	339n42	Epigenes	
9.57	299	<i>ap.</i> Harpocraton	
9.109	298n6	s.v. Ion	30
10.78	298n10	<i>ap.</i> Callimachus	
		F 449 Pfeiffer	30n31,
Diogenianus 7.83b <i>CPG</i>	386		48n15
Dionysius Chalcos		<i>On the Teachings</i>	
1 West	203n91	<i>Attributed to Orpheus</i>	
3 West	202	<i>ap.</i> Suda	
5 West	185n23	o 654	30, 48n15
		<i>On Ion's Agamemnon</i>	
Dionysius Halicarnassensis		<i>ap.</i> Athenaeus 468c	30–1
<i>De compositione verborum</i>			
12	337n25	<i>Epigonoï</i>	248n21
<i>De Demosthene</i>		<i>Etymologicum Genuinum</i>	
20	101n88	s.v. εὐκηλον	269, 276, 282
<i>De imitatione</i>		s.v. ὀρίγονον	70, 270
(Usener-Radermacher)		s.v. πῖθι	278, 282, 287
31.2.8	218n2		
31.2.10	56n39	<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>	
<i>De Lysia</i>		671.41 Gaisford	278, 287
19	103n91	<i>Etymologicum Orionis</i>	
Dionysius Thrax		s.v. λόγχη	50n22, 139,
<i>Techne grammatike</i>			59, 59n50,
1	140n3		140n3, 142,
Schol. 20.1, 21.17–19	55n38		144, 154, 170
<i>Dissoi Logoi</i> (90 DK)		Euclid 8, 216 Menge	9n39, 59n51,
2.19–20	338n30		180, 272, 341
3	239n78		
3.10	228	Euenus	
Duris of Samos <i>FGrH</i>		*2 West	223n14
76 F67	102	9a West	335n17
Empedocles		Eumelos	
31A7 DK	304n25	<i>Corinthiaka</i>	247n17
31A11 DK	304n25		
31B27.3 DK	317n54	Eupolis (<i>PCG</i>)	
31B35 DK	333n8	<i>Heilotes</i> F148	193n52, 197,
31B102 DK	304n24		197n67
31B103 DK	304	<i>Philoï</i>	
31B129 DK	343n62	F294	290
31B129.3 DK	69n27,	F296	166n35
		<i>Poleis</i>	
		F221	10n45

F246	68n20, 166–7	149.25f.	258n59
F384	124n46	330.41	274
F395	193n52	412.33f.	258n59
Euripides		865.15	386
<i>Aiolos TrGF**38a</i>	335n17	870.12	278, 286
<i>Andromeda</i>	46	1186.65	258n59
<i>Bacchae</i>		1261.24	277, 288n22
278–85	212	1300.4–5	259
618	212	1454.24	38n41
661–2	258n54	1479.27	386
1017	212	1541.43	386
<i>Cretans</i>		1761.31	48n15, 277,
F 82.11–15 Austin	213		287n18
<i>Cyclops</i>		1775.19	278, 287
38–9	151n58	1817.18	278, 286
519–23	212	1942.4	209
<i>Hecuba</i>		<i>Commentary on the</i>	
239–50	251n30,	<i>Periegesis of Dionysius</i>	
	251n31	476	275
972	211n17	Gorgias	
Schol. <i>Hecuba</i> 241	251n29	82B13 DK	337n25
<i>Helen</i>		82A24 DK	337n25
214–6	207n6,	<i>Encomium to Helen</i>	59, 228
	257n47	<i>Olympic Orations</i>	338n34
<i>Heracleidae</i>		<i>Peri Kairou</i>	336, 337n25
40	214	Harpocration	
<i>Hippolytus</i>		s.v. <i>Θίασος</i>	282, 288n25
433–481	239n77	s.v. <i>Ion</i>	9n39, 18n5,
500–502	239n77		28, 29, 30,
Argum. <i>Hippolytus</i>			49n15, 52n30,
2	2n10, 68n23,		59, 77n10,
	339n37		149n51, 298,
<i>Ion</i>			306n28, 312,
74–5	146n31		314, 315,
1575–89	146n31		316n51, 317,
<i>Iphigenia Aulidensis</i>			344n72
345	198n68	Hegesinous	
1162	198n68	<i>Atthis</i>	247n17
<i>Medea</i>		Hellanicus of	
825ff.	64n1	Lesbos <i>FGrH</i> 4	
1164	253n33	F48	146n31
<i>Hypothesis</i>	56n39	F22	142n12
<i>Rhesus</i>		F71	140n1, 169
506–7	253	F125	43n16, 146n31,
<i>Supplices</i>			146n32
901–8	150n54		143n18
F929b	143n18,		
	144n22		
Eusebius		Heraclides Ponticus	
<i>Praeparatio</i>		<i>ap. Athenaeus</i>	
<i>evangelica</i> 10.3.6	313	625c	196n60
Eustathius		<i>On the Three Tragic</i>	
111.18	258n59	<i>Poets ap. Diogenes</i>	
		Laertius	
		5.88	55n39

Heraclitus		694	336n20
22B1 DK	299	763–4	345n75
22B40 DK	340n46	10 M-W	143n18
22B129 DK	306	25 M-W	151n58
Hermippus F82.5 PCG	244n6	238 M-W	147n36
Herodian		Hesychius	
<i>Katholike prosodia</i>		δ 145	259
1.25.18 Lentz	209, 282	ε 5919	282
F 24 Hunger	252	ε 6050	282
F 25 Hunger	252–3	ε 6558	96n72
Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων		ε 6925	269, 276
2.767.20 Lentz	48n15, 277, 287n18	κ 1495	209
		κ 4426	48n15, 270
		μ 3	48n15, 272, 288
Herodotus		μ 621	248n22
<i>Histories</i>		μ 923	277, 288n22
1.7	284	ν 601	11n46, 207, 252, 257
1.29	297		5n23, 248n22
1.29.1	107	ο 922	70
1.142	143n16, 146n32	σ 224	44n57, 282
1.146	143n16, 146n32	σ 1515	290
1.146.1	67n14	φ 141	
1.147	143n16, 146n31	Himerius	
1.205	229	<i>Eclogae</i>	
1.212	235n59	14.1	344n70
2.39.2	76n5	Hippocrates of Cos	
2.116.1	81n22	<i>De aera, aquis, locis</i>	
2.121	117n19	4	76n5
2.178	143n16	<i>De affectionibus interioribus</i>	
3.121	108	20	76n5
3.125.1	107	21	76n5
4.95	297	37	76n5
4.138	162n21	<i>De articulis</i>	
4.180	286n11	4	300n14
5.66	152n67	<i>De diaeta in morbis acutis</i>	
5.97	146n31	6	313
6.132ff.	135	<i>De virginibus morbis</i>	
7.95	146n32	1	300n14
8.111	93n64	<i>Epidemiae</i>	76n5
8.124.2–3	83n31	6, part. 1. 120a69–b2	35n37, 267n3
8.132	163n22	<i>Prognosticon</i>	
9.26–7	141n4	25	76n5
9.105	163	[<i>Epistulae</i>]	
9.106	146n31, 146n32, 225	27	267n3
Hesiod		Homer	
<i>Aspis</i>	248n19	<i>Iliad</i>	
<i>Catalogue of Women</i>	248n19	1.350	212
<i>Theogony</i> 27–8	228	1.481–2	214n24
<i>Works and Days</i>		2.559–68	248n21
178	200n75	2.594–9	204
		2.595–6	274
		3.126	214n23

4.365–400	150n54	19.325 AT	258
4.404–10	248n21	24.616 b	283n4
5.83	214n23	Schol. <i>Odyssey</i>	
5.487–9	259n60	6.164 [537 <i>PMG</i>]	145n26
5.800–13	150n54	11.321	148n40
8.18–27	257n50	21.22–37	283n3
8.221	214n23	<i>Homeric Hymn to Apollo</i>	
9.71–2	244n7	172	246n16
9.200	214n23	<i>Homeric Hymn to Hermes</i>	
10.284–90	150n54	25–51	191
10.713	344n70	37–8	201n84
12.310	122n42	435ff.	191
13.703	213	516–7	191
13.754	257n51,	Hyginus	
	258n52	<i>Fabulae</i> 129	151n58, 151n59
13.754–5	258n56	<i>Hymn to Number</i> ,	
	215	F 309 Kern	341n51
14.16–22	151n63	Hyperides	
14.115–6	214n24	6.35	46n4
16.391	214n23	<i>Chiakos</i> F 194 Jensen	160
17.360–1	214n23	Iamblichus	
17.547	214n23	<i>Vita Pythagorae</i>	
17.551	214n23	82	308n31
19.325	258, 258n59	257	343n61
21.326	214n24	267	306n28
21.551	214n25	Iohannes Alexandrinus	
23.270	259, 260n62	<i>Commentary on Hippocrates</i>	
24.644–5	214n23	<i>Epidemics</i> 6, part.	
24.775	259	1.120a69–b2	35n37,
24.796	214n23		267n3
<i>Odyssey</i>		Ion of Chios	
1.183	213	TRAGEDY	
3.8	38n41	<i>Agamemnon</i>	
4.115	214n23	1 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
4.219ff.	235	19 F1	31, 48n15,
4.235–89	254n36		52n31, 259,
4.252–5	252		259n61, 310n35
4.427	214n25	2 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
4.572	214n25	19 F2	3n12
6.42–7	257n50	<i>Alcmene</i>	
9.196–8	244n7	7 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
9.197–8	244n7	19 F6	209
10.309	214n25	8 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
11.237	144n22	19 F7	280n35
12.91	342n52	<i>Argeioi</i> 11 Leurini =	
12.91–2	278n33	<i>TrGF</i> 19 F9	70
13.32	213	<i>Eurytidai</i>	
21.22–37	283n3	13 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
Schol. <i>Iliad</i>		19 F10	48n15, 269
Θ 545 (<i>Anecdota Parisina</i>		16 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
3.46.6–8 Cramer)	48n15, 277	19 F13	48n15, 270
O 714 (<i>Anecdota</i>			
<i>Parisina</i> 3.387.10ff.			
Cramer)	386		
13.754 bT	258n56		

<i>Laertes</i> 18 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		33 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F14	209	19 F27	278, 287
<i>Mega Drama</i>		34 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		19 F31	282
19 F15	248n22	35 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
20 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		19 F32	282, 288n25
19 F16	248n22	36 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
21 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		19 F33	209, 282
19 F17	5n23, 248n22	37* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
<i>Omphale</i>		19 F33a	283n2
22–38 + 73*		38 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		19 F21	279, 286
19 FF17a–33a + F59	12n49, 282–3	[73* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F59]	12n49, 278, 287
22 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		<i>Phoenix or Kaineus or Oineus</i>	
19 F17a	48n15, 275, 277, 283, 286, 292	41 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F41	266n1
23 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		42 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F18	275, 282, 286n10	19 F39	210, 333n8
24 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		43 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F19	43n57	19 F40	210
25 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		44 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F20	277, 288n22, 310n35	19 F38	43, 249n24, 317
26a Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		<i>Phoenix</i> 1	
19 F22	197, 272, 282, 283, 286, 288n23, 333n8	45 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F36	43, 249n24
26b Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		48 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F23	48n15, 197n64, 272, 282, 288, 333n8	19 F41b	269
		<i>Phoenix</i> 2	
27 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		49 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F24	225, 277, 287, 309n34	19 F42	272n21
28 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		<i>Phrouroi</i>	
19 F25	48n15, 277, 287, 287n18	<i>TrGF</i> 19 F**43a	250n27, 253n34
29* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		51 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F*30	278, 282, 286, 342	19 F43b	252
30 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		52 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F28	269, 276, 282	19 F43c	252
31 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		53 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F29	3, 278, 286, 309n34, 339n39	19 F44	250, 251n28, 266n1
32 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		54 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
19 F26	278, 286	19 F45	210, 252, 272n21
		55 Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F46	11n46, 207, 252, 257
		<i>Teukros</i>	2, 70, 248
		<i>Incertarum fabularum fragmenta</i>	
		60* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F50	209
		61* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>	
		19 F51	310n35

63* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		90 Leurini =	
19 F53 =		27 West	8n34, 50n21,
746 <i>PMG</i>	211n17		120, 174n64,
68* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>			182n12, 185,
19 F53f	304n24		218, 221, 222,
69* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>			223, 224n20,
19 F54	43n57		270, 333n8,
70ab* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>			337n29
19 FF58, 55	336n20	91 Leurini =	
71* Leurini =		28 West	70, 270
<i>TrGF</i> 19 F56	vii	92 Leurini =	
72* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>		30 West	5n26, 10n42,
19 F57	342n53		59n51, 200,
73* Leurini = <i>TrGF</i>			270, 301, 305,
19 F59	12n49, 278,		306, 323n16,
	287		340
151*** Leurini	3n17, 47n11	93 Leurini =	
152*** Leurini	3n12, 47n11	32 West	9n38, 59n51,
[Sophocles <i>TrGF</i> F754]	280		157, 180,
[Sophocles <i>TrGF</i>			180n8,
FF**1130–1133]	3n17, 47n11		181n10, 182,
DITHYRAMB			183, 183n14,
<i>Antigone</i> 83 Leurini =			188, 198, 200,
740 <i>PMG</i>	12n50		201, 202, 203,
<i>Aioios</i> 84 Leurini =			205, 271, 272,
745 <i>PMG</i>	33, 34, 167,		341
	342	94 Leurini =	
MELIC		31 West	10n45, 48,
86* Leurini =			72n32, 119n27,
744 <i>PMG</i>	11n46, 212,		132, 145n29,
	237n71,		174, 223n15,
	270, 309n34		234, 244n5,
HYMN			269, 316n53
87 Leurini =		95* Leurini	
742 <i>PMG</i>	3n15, 232,	[= 30A West]	17n4, 59n51,
	331		310n35, 342
ENCOMIUM		96* Leurini =	
88 Leurini =		29 West	12n51, 65n7,
743 <i>PMG</i>	3n14, 48n15		91n60, 140,
ELEGY			140n3,
89 Leurini =			142n14, 146,
26 West	69, 69n27,		147, 147n36,
	182n12,		148, 171n51
	198n70,	97 Leurini = <i>FGH</i>	
	202, 211,	392 F3 = 7 G.-P.	
	218, 221,		50n22, 59,
	223n14,		59n50, 139,
	224n19,		140n3, 142,
	224n20,		143, 144, 154,
	225, 229,		170
	230, 231,	121 Leurini =	
	232, 237,	<i>TrGF</i> 19 F53dd	
	304n25,	[= 32A West] =	
	343, 343n62	10 G.-P.	118n24

PROSE

Khisis (Foundation of Chios)

[96* Leurini =
29 West]

12n51, 65n7,
91n60, 140,
140n3, 142n14, 146,
147, 147n36, 148,
171n51

97 Leurini =
FGrH 392 F3

[= 7 G.-P.]

50n22, 59, 59n50,
139, 140n3, 142, 143,
144, 154, 170

98 Leurini =
FGrH 392 F1

4n18, 5n21, 12n52,
50n23, 58n47, 65,
139, 140n3, 142,
143, 144, 146n32,
151n61, 171, 247,
257n48

99 Leurini =
FGrH 392 F2

4n18, 5n21, 31n32,
50, 69n25, 100, 139,
144, 145, 145n29,
146, 154, 170n48

[128** Leurini =
FGrH 395 F1]

139n1, 170n48

Epidemiai

100 Leurini

35n37, 267n3

101 Leurini =

FGrH 392 F7

2n8, 35n37, 56n42,
90n58

102 Leurini =

FGrH 392 F5

35n37

103 Leurini =

FGrH 392 F4

35n37, 95n68

104 Leurini =

FGrH 392 F6

5n26, 10n43,
35n37, 56n42, 68n22,
77n5, 82, 90n58,
108, 111, 117, 172,
172n57, 173, 184n20,
215n27, 227, 256n46,
265n74, 267, 268,
309n34, 321n8,
337n29

105* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F12

2n7, 117

106* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F13

2n7, 5n26, 10n44,
91, 111, 116, 125,
149n51, 172n56,
174, 175, 183n15,
223, 226, 269

107* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F14

2n7, 35n37, 95,
119, 167, 184, 269

108* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F22

2n8, 56n42,
120n33,
150n52,
172n54, 338

109* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F15

4n18, 5n26,
58n49, 91,
101, 111,
118, 127,
184n20,
269n9, 331n1

110* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F16

5n26, 46n4,
103, 119,
128, 269n9

111* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F9

5n26, 6, 20n14,
35n37, 77n6,
120n34, 319,
321, 321n8,
323, 325,
338n32

112* Leurini =

FGrH 392 F11

5n26, 50n22

Ekdemetikos

Hypomnemata

19n12
19n12, 22,
35, 35n37,
95n68,
342n54
3, 3n16,
8n37, 33,
35, 77,
342n54

Presbeutikos

Sunekdemetikos

113 Leurini =

FGrH 392 F8

3n16, 342n54

Triagmos

114 Leurini =

36B1 DK

18n5, 28,
28n28, 32,
46n3, 49n15,
52n30, 59, 60,
60n58, 77n10,
149n51, 297,
298, 306,
316n51, 330n45,
344n72

115* Leurini =

36A6 DK

28, 60, 60n57,
304, 310n36

- 116 Leurini =
 36B2 [texts I & II] DK 30, 31, 59, 301,
 340, 340n46
- 116(I) Leurini =
 36B2 DK 30, 306, 315
- 116(II) Leurini =
 36B2 DK 323n16
- 117* Leurini =
 36A7 DK = *FGrH* 392
 F26 60, 60n55, 308,
 315n46, 342n53
- 118* Leurini =
 36B3 DK = *FGrH* 392
 FF17ab 43n57, 52, 59,
 60n56, 98, 307,
 330, 344n72
- [68* Leurini = 36B3b
 DK = *TrGF* 19
 F53f] 304n24
Kosmologikos 9n39, 35, 298,
 298n10, 312, 315,
 342n54
- Peri meteoron* 9n39, 33, 37,
 298, 298n10,
 312
- Incertae sedis fragmenta*
 119 Leurini =
FGrH 392 F20 =
 36B3a DK 17n3
 120 Leurini =
TrGF 19 F53c 333n8
 121 Leurini =
TrGF 19 F53dd =
 [32A West] =
 10 G.-P. 118n24
 123 Leurini =
TrGF 19 F62 17n4
 125 Leurini =
FGrH 392 F21 58n47
- Dubia*
 128** Leurini = *FGrH*
 395 F1 139n1,
 170n48
- 129** Leurini = *FGrH*
 392 F23 341n51
- Spuria et falsa*
 138*** Leurini 337n24
 139*** Leurini 337n24
 140*** Leurini 2n7, 341n51
 141*** Leurini 337n24
 151*** Leurini 3n17, 47n11
 152*** Leurini 3n12, 47n11
 153*** Leurini 336n24
 154g*** Leurini 150n51
- Ion of Samos
CEG 2.224–8, no. 819 336n24
ap. AP 7.43 = 138***
 Leurini 337n24
ap. AP 7.44 = 139***
 Leurini 337n24
- Isocrates
Against the Sophists
 13 338n30
Antidosis
 268 28n28, 46n3,
 59, 60n58, 297,
 306, 330n45,
 344n72
- Evagoras*
 9.65 46n4
Panathenaicus
 85 338n30
Panegyricus
 4.83 46n4
 4.186 46n4
Philippus
 5.111–2 46n4
- Istros *FGrH* 334 F10 141n8
- Iulius Paulus *Sententiae*
 3.6.51 62n64
- Libanius
Epistulae
 1262 63n65
Orationes
 1.142 387
Little Iliad 250n27,
 253n34
- [Longinus] *On the Sublime*
 11.2 103n91
 12.5 103n91
 33.5 3, 25, 43n57,
 48, 56n42, 61,
 72n31, 267,
 316n48
 34.1 59n49
 34.2–3 101n88
- Lucian
Dialogi deorum
 15 291n35
Fugitivi
 33 197n65
How to Write History
 10 291
Saltatio
 74–5 336n22

Lycophron 83A6 DK	200n77, 343n58	129a (201, p. 126 Westerink)	336n20
Lycophron <i>Alexandra</i> 569–83	145n27	<i>On Sevens</i>	341n47
Schol. <i>Alexandra</i> 570	145n27, 145n28	Orphica, F 309 Kern	341n51
581	145n26	<i>Oracula Sibyllina</i> 2.67	96n72
Lysias 12.35	76n5	Ovid <i>Ars amatoria</i> 2.217–21	291n36
Manganas, S. <i>Chias</i>	71	<i>Fasti</i> 2.303–58	291n36
Manuel Bryennius <i>Harmonica</i> p. 116 Jonker	9n38, 59n51, 180, 272, 341	<i>Heroides</i> 9.53–118	291n36
<i>Marmor Parium</i> <i>FGrH</i> 239 F27	143n16, 146n31	<i>Metamorphoses</i> 13.632–74	145n26
Menander F 512 <i>PCG</i>	333n10	Palladas <i>ap. AP</i> 10.52	333n10, 344n70
Menander Rhetor (Russell-Wilson) 333.21–2 342.19–20	333n8 333n8	Panyassis <i>Herakleia</i> <i>Ionika</i>	248n19 247n17
<i>Meropis</i> , <i>SH</i> 903A	247n17	Parmenides 28B1.3 DK	338n32
Metrodorus F 3A	257n48	Parthenius <i>Narrationum amatoriarum libellus</i> 1	147n35
Mnaseas Patareus <i>ap. Zenobius</i> Athous 2.35 [4.270 Bühler] <i>ap. POxy</i> 13. 1611 (F 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127)	48n15 48n15	Pausanias (Atticist) v 5 Erbse 3n14	
Musaeus <i>Hero and Leander</i> 150–1	291n39	Pausanias <i>Description of Greece</i> 1.5.2 1.15.4 1.42.2 1.43.1 1.44.7 2.2.1 2.13.8 2.35.1 3.12.10 3.26.2 3.26.10 4.2.1 4.30.4 4.35.11 5.10.1 5.14.4 5.14.9	152n66 149n48 141n8 331n1 143n18 334n12 151n64 331n1 187n31 331n1 331n1 331n1 331n1 339n36 332 3n15, 232, 331 332 332 332, 334n15 339n38 332n3 332n5
<i>Naupactia</i>	247n17, 331n1	5.14.10 5.15.10 5.15.11	
Nepos <i>Pelopidas</i> 1.1	81		
<i>New Testament</i> , 2 Corinthians 6.14	96n72		
Nicander <i>Alexipharmaea</i> 560–63	201n84		
Schol. <i>Theriaca</i> 11	55n38		
Nicochares <i>PCG</i> VII, 7 <i>Old Testament</i> , Leviticus 19.19	291 96n72		
Olympiodorus <i>Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato</i>			

5.21.15	336n23	Philemon <i>ap.</i>	
5.25.4	78	Athenaeus 468de	48n15
6.17.7	338n34	Philo Judaeus	
6.20.8	335n16	<i>Quod omnis probus</i>	
7.2ff.	146n31	<i>liber sit</i> 134	211n17
7.3.6	143, 143n16, 143n18	Philochorus <i>FGrH</i>	
7.4.2–3	67n14	328 F117	97n75
7.4.8	22, 140n3, 146n32,	Philodemus	
151n61,		<i>De pietate</i>	
7.4.8–10	257n48, 331n1 4n18, 5n21, 12n52, 50n23, 58n47, 65, 139, 142, 143, 144, 171, 247	(<i>PHerc</i> 243 VI 3–12) p. 13 Gomperz	17n4, 59n51, 310n35, 342
7.4.10	171	Philolaus of Croton	
7.5.13	147n33	44A19 DK	309
8.12.5	247n17	44B1 DK	303n22
8.25.9	333n9	Philoponus	
9.24.1	143n18	<i>De generatione et corruptione</i>	
9.27.2	331n1	p. 207, 16–20 Vitelli	28, 60n57,
9.27.3	331n1	304,	310n36
9.29.1	247n17	p. 277, 13–4 Vitelli	60n57, 310n36
9.30.1	191n45	Philostratus	
9.30.12	331n1	<i>Vitae sophistarum</i> 1.11.7	78
9.34.6–8	143n18	[Phocylides]	
10.7.1	343n65	<i>Gnomologia</i> 15	96n72
10.7.2	337n24	<i>Phokais</i>	247n17
10.10.1	149n48	<i>Phoronis</i>	247n17
10.18.7	337n24	Photius	
10.26.1	331n1	<i>Bibliotheca</i>	
10.31.3	331n1	320a19–20	334n15
10.32.8	331n1	<i>Lexicon</i> (Theodoridis)	
Phaedrus		α 466	5n26, 50n22
<i>Fabulae</i> 5.8	344n70	α 1294	268–70
Phanios <i>ap.</i> AP 12.31	344n70	α 1304	333n8
Pherecrates		α 2304	118n24
<i>Cheiron</i>		α 3262	304n24
F155 <i>PCG</i>	186	ε 1967	386
Pherecydes of Athens <i>FGrH</i> 3		ε 2224	269, 276
F2	148n12	θ 180	288n25
F82b	283n3	ι 287	32n34
FF98–101	143n18	<i>Lexicon</i> (Porson)	
F102	143n16,	301.7	11n46, 207n5, 252, 257
143n20,		339.12	5n23
FF103–104	146n32	495.21	385
F140	143n18	617.23	3n14
F149	145n27	Phrynichus	
F153	142n11	<i>Eclogē</i> 286 Fischer	58n47
F155	141n8	Phrynichus	
	146n31, 146n32	<i>Mousai</i>	199n73

Phylarchus <i>FCrH</i>		<i>Gorgias</i>	
81 F43	101n85, 130n62	455e	99n81
		515de	99n81
		518e–519a	99n81
Pindar		<i>Hippias maior</i>	
<i>Isthmian Odes</i>		281a	79n14
1.41–51	122n40	282de	76n5
6.35	274n27	<i>Hippias minor</i>	
7.1–9	64n1	346a	79n14
<i>Nemean Odes</i>		363c	79n14
1.46–7	335n17	363cd	338n32
6.26–8	274n27	368c8–d2	78
9.48	223n14	368cd	338n32
9.55	274n27	<i>Ion</i>	
10.90	235n61	530a	327
<i>Olympian Odes</i>		530b	328
2.10	235n61	531–3	79n18
2.56–80	340	532c8–9	79n18
2.83–85	202n88	534bc	42
2.89–90	274n27	534c1–4	79, 79n16
2.97	317n54	536b8	209n13
3.20	235n61	541e	229
6.16	235n61	<i>Laches</i> 188d	187n29
6.63	339n36	<i>Leges</i>	
13.47–8	336n20	639de	219
13.93–5	274n27	641c8–d2	227n29
<i>Paeon</i> 6	339n35	647e–8a	236n64
<i>Pythian Odes</i>		658b	193n52
1.1–4	183n14	666a8–c2	235n59
1.20	257n50	700ab	338n35
1.81–2	339n41	700e	187n28
4.120	235n61	709b	344n71
5.18	235n61	811a	51n25
6.5–9	205n98	846d–847a	59n49
8.95–7	208n7	<i>Lysis</i> 209b	199
9.78–80	340	<i>Menexenus</i> 235e–6a	193
12.19	181n10	<i>Meno</i> 99d	83n31
43 Snell-Maehler	249n25	<i>Parmenides</i> 127cd	338n32
125 Snell-Maehler	195	<i>Phaedo</i>	
168b Snell-Maehler	309n34, 339n39	87b2ff	209
		96a–99c	325n26
		99c	319n3
Pisander		<i>Phaedrus</i>	
<i>Herakleia</i>		230c–e	320n4
248n19	248n19	235c	140n3
Pittacus <i>ap.</i> D. L. 1.79	336n20	235cd	337n24
Plato		236ab	337n24
<i>Alcibiades</i>		267a6–b5	339n42
133a	211, 211n17	270–1	99n81
<i>Apology</i>		<i>Protagoras</i>	
20a3	76n5	310e5	76n5
26de	46n5	315c8	76n5
<i>Crito</i>		337d6	94n67
52b–53a	320n4	342c7	76n5
<i>Euthydemus</i>		347cd	192
272c	193		

<i>Republic</i>		<i>Agis and Cleomenes</i>	
370b ff.	59n49	29(8).1	101
394e ff.	59n49	<i>Alexander</i>	
398e	196n60	1.2	81
399d	187	8	55n39
531b	201n80	<i>Antony</i>	
607a	338n35	14.7	103n91
<i>Sophist</i> 242c	60n58	33.2–4	99n80
<i>Symposium</i>		54.5	102n89
176a	222n13	58	62n64
196a	132n68	<i>Aristides</i>	
197de	239n80	23.4–5	146
198b1–3	229	25.9	99n81
223d	55, 79n18, 246n16	<i>Cimon</i>	
<i>Timaeus</i>		1–2	92n63
21b	193n52	2.3	125n49
27a	229	3.3	132
31bc	301n17	4.5	89n56, 91, 94, 97n77, 101
35ab	301n17	5.1	93, 94
36c	301n17	5.3	2n7, 117
52–58	301n17	5.5–6	93
55cd	313	5.6	94
<i>Epistles</i>		6.2	125n49
2.314c	319n3	6.4–7	92
7.330b8	76n5	7.4–5	2n7, 341n51
7.330bc	319n3	9.1	175
7.338e	76n5	9.1–6	2n7, 5n26, 10n44, 90–1, 111, 116, 125, 149n51, 172n56, 174, 175, 183n15, 223, 226, 269
<i>Epigrams</i>			
22.1 (<i>AP</i> 6.43.1)	101n88	9.2	174
26.4 (<i>AP</i> 9.823.4)	101n88	10.1–6	131n67
[<i>Erastai</i>]		10.7	94n67
135e ff.	59n49	11.2	125n49
Schol.		12.2	93n66
<i>Alcibiades</i>		12.3–4	164
129a	336n20	12.4	94
Schol. <i>Menexenus</i>		13.3	93n66
235e	290n32	13.5–6	93n66
Schol. <i>Timaeus</i>		14.5	91n59, 97n77
20a	59n49	15.3	10n45
Plato Comicus		16	138
F71.12–14 <i>PCG</i>	195n60	16.1	91n59, 97n77
Pliny the Younger		16.2	93n66
<i>Epistulae</i> 3.5	51n25	16.3	89n56, 91n59, 91n61, 93n65, 97n77, 125n49
Pliny the Elder		16.8–10	2n7, 35n37, 94–5, 119, 167, 184–5, 269
<i>Naturalis historia</i>			
4.63	275		
7.56	147n35		
34.55	343n65		
Plutarch			
<i>Agesilaus</i>			
10	187n31		

16.9–10	101	13.7	99n81
17.1–2	96	13.10	100
17.2	89n54	13.11	190
17.3	97, 153	13.15–6	100
18.7	93	13.16	99, 100,
<i>Demosthenes</i>			102n90
3.2	336n20	14	89n54
<i>Demetrius</i>		14.2	104n96
1.7	99n81	15.2	99n81
<i>Lucullus</i>		15.3	100
42	62n64	16.2	100
42.2	94n67	16.4	131
45(2).6	99n81	16.7–9	89n54
<i>Lycurgus</i>		17.1	104, 105
21	205n97	20.3–4	105n97
<i>Nicias</i>		22.3	135
29	263n69	24	99
<i>Pericles</i>		24.5	106n99
1–2	102	24.7	99n81
2.5	99	24.9	290n32
3.4–7	100	24.9–10	100
4.1–6	101	26.1	91n59, 100
4.6	104n96	28.1–3	102, 103n91
5.1	99n81, 104n96,	28.4–5	104n93
	128	28.7	5n26, 119, 128,
5.1–2	99, 100		268n7, 269n9
5.3	4n18, 5n26, 91,	28.7–8	46n4, 103
	111, 118, 119,	28.8	103n91, 117n22
	127, 184n20,	29	89n54
	268n7, 269n9	29.1–2	101
5.3–4	58n49, 100–1,	30.4	99, 100
	104, 331n1	31–2	99
5.4	118–9, 128	31.1	104n96
7.4–5	131	33.4	105n97
7.5	128	33.8	100
7.5–6	175n65	36.6	91n59, 100
7.6	106n99	36.8	104n96
7.8	99n81, 100	37	105
8	89n54	37.5	106
8.1	104n96	38.1	104n96
8.2	99n81	38.3–4	105
8.3–4	100	39.2	105–6
8.5	89n54	39.3	106n99
8.9	91n59, 100n84	39.8	104n96
9.1	99n81, 100	<i>Romulus</i>	
9.2	127n55	2–3	99n80
9.5	101	2.4	99n80
10.1	101	2.4–8	99n80
10.5	89n54, 104n95	3.4	99n80
10.6	103n92	4.2–4	99n80
12	89n54	27.7	99n80
12–3	99	<i>Solon</i>	
12.2	103n92	10.1–2	141n7
12.16	91n59	<i>Sulla</i>	
		26	46n6

<i>Themistocles</i>		<i>De recta ratione</i>	
2.3	91n59	<i>audiendi</i>	
2.4	92, 184n17	45c	343–4
2.8	89n54	<i>De sera numinis</i>	
4.3	91n59	<i>vindicta</i>	
7.4	93n64	561b	99n81
21	93n64	<i>De sollertia animalium</i>	
24.5	91n59	971f	386
<i>Theseus</i>		<i>De tranquillitate animi</i>	
1.5	99n80	464f	51n25
20.2	12n51, 65n7, 91n60, 140, 140n3, 145n28, 147, 147n35, 171n51	466d	vii
	141n8	470f	244n6
29	141n8	<i>De unius in republica</i>	
<i>Comparison of Cimon and Lucullus</i>		827b5–8	187n30
1.4	92, 141n8	<i>Instituta Laconica</i>	
3.4	93n66	15	205n97
<i>Comparison of Demetrius</i>		17	187n31
<i>and Antony</i> 3	291n35	<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>	
<i>An semī republica gerenda sit</i>		612c1	230
23	188n33	612e–615c	227n29
<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i>		613a	337
113b	43n57	614d	101n88
116d	336n20	621c	219
<i>Convivium septem sapientium</i>		658c	342n53
150e	201n83	673a	231n41
154bc	231n39	717b	43n57, 52, 59, 60n56, 98, 172n54, 307, 330, 344n72
153e–154b	231n41	<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas</i>	
154b	231n41	<i>audire debeat</i>	
<i>De cohibenda ira</i>		29f	2n8, 56n42, 120n33, 150n52, 172n54, 338
457d	51n25	<i>Quomodo quis suos in</i>	
<i>De facie in orbe lunae</i>		<i>virtute sentiat profectus</i>	
929a	342n53	79de	2n8, 56n42, 120n33, 150n52, 187n31
<i>De fortuna Alexandri</i>		84a	338
328a	48n13	<i>Regem et imperatorum apophthegmata</i>	
<i>De fortuna Romanorum</i>		172ce	51n25
316d	52, 59, 60n56, 98, 307, 330, 344n72	[<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i>]	
316d–7c	98	841f	47n7
317ab	99	Pollux	
317de	98	2.88	3n16, 22, 342n54
319d	99	2.95	278, 282, 286, 342
320a	99n80	4.101	185n23
320b	99n80	4.107	205n97
320bc	99n80	5.101	48n15, 277, 287n18
320c–321b	99n80		
321cf	99		
323b	99n80		
[<i>De musica</i>]			
1137b	186		

6.98	277, 288n22	Schol. Aratus	
7.58	291n37	<i>Phaenomena</i>	
7.60	278, 287	640 Martin	144n23, 147n36
10.92	385	Scythinus 1 West	200n77, 343n58
10.177	248n22		
Polybius 7.7.1	87n51	Seneca	
Porphry F 408 Smith	313	<i>Agamemnon</i>	3n12
Posidippus <i>ap. AP</i>		<i>Hercules Oetaeus</i>	
16.275	344n70	371–7	291n36
Proclus		Servius	
<i>ap. Phot. Bibl.</i>		<i>Commentary on Vergil Aeneid</i>	
320a19–20	334n15	2.81	145n26
<i>Chrestomathia</i>		2.166	256n45
(Allen 1912:		<i>Commentary on Vergil Georgics</i>	
5.107.4–7)	250, 250n27, 253, 253n34	1.9	151n60
Prodicus (DK 84)		Sextus Empiricus	
B1	79n14	<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	
B2	79n14	2.5 (310–318)	60n58
Propertius		Sidonius Apollinaris	
3.11.17–20	291n36	<i>Epistulae</i>	
3.11.29ff.	291n36	9.9.6–8	63n65
4.9.47–50	291n36	Simonides of Ceos	
Protagoras		19.1 West	246n16, 270n16
<i>Kataballontes logoi</i>	314	10 West—18 West	333n8
80A1 DK	339n42	537 <i>PMG</i>	145n26
Quintilian		Simplicius	
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		<i>in Aristotelis de Caelo Commentarii</i>	
6.2.24	103n91	p. 8.23–27	303
10.1	58n46	p. 8.28ff.	303
10.1.54	55n39	p. 9.10–11	
10.1.66–68	55n39	Hankinson 302n21	302n21
Rhegas, Ph. Χάρτα		<i>in Aristotelis de Physica Commentarii</i>	
τῆς Ἑλλάδος	71	25.19	304n25
Sallustius		151.28	300n14
<i>Introduction to</i>		151.31	300
<i>Sophocles' Antigone</i>	12n50	331.10	304
Sappho (Lobel-Page)		457.16–17	311n37
F 118	183n14	Solon 4a West	146n31
F 198	331n1	Sophocles	
Satyrus <i>FGrH</i> 631 F1	147n35, 151n58	<i>Aikhmalotides</i>	255n41
Satyrus		<i>Aias</i>	255n41
<i>Vita Euripidis (POxy 1176)</i>		<i>Aias Lokros</i>	255n41
F 39, col. 19	263n69	<i>Anteroridai</i>	255n41
F 39, col. 22	188n33	<i>Antigone</i>	12, 23, 68
<i>Sayings of the Spartans</i>	51	18–20	214
		<i>Epigonoι</i>	248n21
		<i>Euryalos</i>	255n41
		<i>Helen</i>	255n41
		<i>Ichneutai</i> 300	201n84
		<i>Iphigenia Aulidensis</i>	
		FF305–12	255n41

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------|
| <i>Lakainai</i> | 255-6 | Sosicrates | |
| F367 | 256n45 | <i>Successions</i> | 322n14 |
| FF367-9a | 255n41, | Stephanus Byzantius s.v. | |
| | 256n44 | <i>Teos</i> | 143n16 |
| <i>Niptra</i> F451a | 255n41 | Stesimbrotus of Thasos <i>FGrH</i> 107 | |
| <i>Nauplios</i> F384 | 270 | F1 | 85, 91n59 |
| <i>Odysseus Akanthoplex</i> | | F2 | 91n59 |
| FF453-61a | 255n41 | F3 | 91n59 |
| <i>Odysseus Mainomenos</i> | | F4 | 85, 91, 97n77 |
| FF462-7 | 255n41 | F5 | 89n56, 91n59, |
| <i>Oedipus Coloneus</i> | 46 | | 97n77 |
| <i>Hypothesis II</i> | 46n6 | F6 | 91n59, 97n77 |
| 663 | 289n27 | F7 | 89n56, 91n59, |
| 668-719 | 64n1 | | 91n61, 93n65, |
| 1481 | 309 | | 97n77 |
| 1549 | 309 | F8 | 91n59 |
| <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> | 3, 13, 267 | F9 | 91n59 |
| 473 | 257n50 | F10 | 97n77 |
| [<i>Oeneus</i>] | 3n17 | F10a | 85n39 |
| <i>On the chorus</i> | 42n52 | F11 | 91n59, 97n77 |
| <i>Palamedes</i> FF478-81 | 255n41 | F16 | 91n59 |
| <i>Philoctetes</i> | 255n41, | | |
| | 255n42 | Stobaeus (Wachsmuth-Hense) | |
| <i>Polyxene</i> | 255n41 | 1.6.7 | 53 |
| <i>Skynioi</i> FF553-61 | 255n41 | 1.8.16 | 337n29 |
| <i>Syndeipnoi</i> FF562-71 | 255n41 | 1.10 | 60n56, 60n58 |
| <i>Teukros</i> FF576-9b | 255n41 | 1.26.1 | 60n55 |
| <i>Thamyras</i> | 204, 274 | 3.4.116 | 387 |
| F238 | 273, 288n20 | 3.29.89 | 2n8, 338 |
| <i>Trachiniae</i> | 151n58, | 4.52.36 | 3n12 |
| | 274-81 | | |
| 69-70 | 289 | Strabo | |
| 71 | 289n27 | <i>Geography</i> | |
| 74 | 275 | 1.3.19 | 275, 282, 286n10 |
| 237 | 275 | 13.3.3 | 146n32 |
| 248-53 | 279 | 13.3.6 | 107n102 |
| 248-57 | 289 | 14.1.3 | 143n16, 146n31, |
| 252-3 | 286n12 | | 146n32 |
| 365-7 | 279 | 14.1.35 | 43n57, 48, 140n3 |
| 752-3 | 276 | <i>Suda</i> | |
| 780 | 276 | α 729 | 5n26, 50n22 |
| 787-8 | 276 | α 731 | 2n10, 10n41, 38, |
| 1062-3 | 289n27 | | 234, 271, 339n37 |
| 1071-5 | 289n27 | α 1123 | 38 |
| 1165-8 | 276 | α 1280 | 38n41 |
| 1195-9 | 276 | α 3932 | 55n38 |
| F710 | 211n17 | δ 429 | 38n41 |
| F754 | 280 | δ 1029 | 3n13, 3n16, 18, |
| F1032 | 277 | | 18n7, 32, 33, |
| FF**1130-1133 | 3n17, 47n11 | | 342, 345n77 |
| Schol. <i>Trachiniae</i> 253 | 286n12 | θ 380 | 288n25 |
| Sosiades | | ι 487 | 2n10, 3n12, |
| <i>Sayings of</i> | | | 9n39, |
| <i>the Seven Sages</i> | 51 | | 10n41, 18, 18n8, |

	32, 36, 39, 45n1, 45n2, 58n47, 59, 77n9, 145n29, 149n51, 269n8, 283, 297, 298n8, 310n35, 339n37, 341n51	Theophrastus <i>De causis plantarum</i> 5.10.5 <i>De sensibus</i> 21	313 304n24
ι 489	32n34	Theopompus <i>FGrH</i> 115 F103	161
κ 227	44	F104	160
ο 654	9n39, 48n15, 60n54, 312n43	F276	64n3, 146n32, 147n36, 150n57
π 1793	42n49		
π 1794	42n49	F281	94n67
σ 107	42n50	<i>Philippica</i>	160–1
σ 371	250, 266n1		
σ 439	42n50	<i>Thesprotis</i>	247n17
σ 871	42n51		
σ 1397	38n41	Thessalos	
υ 108	3n14	<i>Presbeutikos ap.</i> [Hippocrates]	
χ 314	38n40	<i>Epistulae</i> 27	267n3
Tabula Montefalconii 3 (<i>TrGF</i> CAT A 3)	56n40	Thrasymachus <i>Megale Technē</i>	
Teleclides F36 <i>PCG</i>	197	85B3 DK	160
<i>Telegoneia</i>	247n17, 255n41	Thucydides	
Telestes of Selinus		1.9.4	87n52
810 <i>PMG</i>	195n58	1.10.3	87n52
[Terpander] F 4		1.18.2–19	88n53
Bergk/Gostoli	183n14	1.20.3	87n52
Thales of Miletus		1.21	81n22, 88
11A2 DK	298n10	1.21.1	87, 169
Theocritus		1.68.1	118n26
7.47–8	246n16	1.71.1	162n25
16.45	195n57	1.76–7	162n25
<i>Theognidea</i>		1.90	162
241	182n12	1.90–2	135
475–8	223n14	1.95.1	146n31
479–81	239n80	1.96	225
500	238	1.97	225
503–8	219	1.97.2	87n51, 88n53
522–3	182n12	1.101–2	97n75
555–60	344n70	1.102.1	97n75
681–2	202n87, 202n88	1.116	225
713–4	228n32	1.116–17	173n59
761	182n12	1.132.2–3	84
825	182n12	1.140.1	93n65
941	182n12	2.15	149n48
943	182n12	2.21.1	135n73
993–1002	227n27	2.25.2	83n31
1041	182n12	2.65	100
1056	182n12	2.65.9	93n65,
1229–3	202n85		132
		3.2–3	165n30
		3.9–14	162n17

3.12	162n17	<i>Vita Euripidea</i>	47n8
3.47.5	239n77	<i>Vita Herodotea</i>	270n16
3.82.4.1–2	229		
3.104.4–6	246n16	<i>Vita Sophoclea</i>	
4.51	165, 226	4	271
5.11.1	84n36	20	341n51
5.45	107n106	23	271
5.84.3–113	133	Vitruvius	
5.101	134	<i>De architectura</i>	
5.104	134	5.9.1	184n18, 190n40
5.106	134		
5.108	134	Xenocrates F 9 Heinze	307n30
5.113	135		
6.43	225	Xenophanes (21 DK)	
7.4	198n68	B1	220n5, 337n29
7.77	162		
8.15.1	67n18	B1.15–16	239
8.24.4	67n18, 119n28	B1.21–4	222–3
	161	B1.23	220
8.24.4–5	10n41, 46,	<i>Colonisation of Elea</i>	
8.38.3	67n16, 127, 140, 149n50, 158, 244n4	<i>in Italy</i>	247n17
	67n18	<i>Foundation of Colophon</i>	247n17
8.40.1	67n18	Xenophon	
8.45.4	67n18, 268	<i>Anabasis</i>	
8.74.3	103n91	7.5.14	46n5
8.76.4	103, 117n22	[<i>Athenaion Politeia</i>]	
Timon		1.2	185n23
<i>Silloi</i>	298n6	1.3	123
		1.13	185n23
Timotheus		1.14.8–10	123
<i>Persae</i>		1.16	164n25
202–12	204n96, 205	1.18	77n5
211–12	187	<i>Cyropaedia</i>	
229–30	205	7.5.69	76n5
229–31	186n25, 188	8.2.5–6	58n49
232–3	205	<i>Hellenica</i>	
791.203, 209–10 PMG	199n73	4.7.5	58n49
796 PMG	199n73	5.3.8	130
870 PMG	205n97	6.3.6	141n4
		6.5.33	97n75
Tzetzes		6.5.46–7	141n4
<i>Chiliades</i> 3.957–8	278, 286, 342	<i>Memorabilia (Apomnemoneumata)</i>	
		1.2.61	76n5
in Lycophron <i>Alexandra</i>	2	2.1.21–34	79n14
(<i>TrGF</i> CAT A 2)	56n40	3.9.15	58n49
Varro <i>De lingua Latina</i>		<i>Oeconomicus</i>	79
F 46 Goetz-Schoell	17n3	<i>Respublica Lacadaemoniorum</i>	
		5.3	131
Vergil		5.3.4	121n39
<i>Aeneid</i>		<i>Symposium</i>	
12.701–703	257n51	4 225n21	
Schol. <i>Georgica</i>		4.31	76n5
1.482	17n4	6.1–3	233n45

Xuthus 33 DK	306	Papyri	
Zenis of Chios		<i>PHib</i> 23ff.	201n80
<i>FGH</i> 393 F1	148n42	<i>PHerc</i> 243 VI 3–12	17n4
<i>Peri tes patridos</i>	148	<i>POxy</i> 1083	3n17, 47n11
Zenobius		<i>POxy</i> 1176, F 39,	
1.48 <i>CPG</i>	3n14	col. 22	188n33
5.68 <i>CPG</i>	386	<i>POxy</i> 1611	
Zenobius Athous 2.35		F 2, col. 1, ll. 121–127	48n15, 275,
(Miller <i>Mélanges</i>			277, 283,
361–2; 4.270 Bühler)	3n14, 48n15		286, 292
Zoilus <i>ap.</i> Athenaeus		F 16	283n2, 292
277d	255n43	<i>POxy</i> 2382	3n12, 47n11
		<i>POxy</i> 2400	57n45
[Zonaras] <i>Lexikon</i> p. 1045		<i>POxy</i> 2453	3n17, 47n11
Tittmann	288n25	<i>POxy</i> 3700	291n38

* * *

* * *

Inscriptions

<i>CEG</i> 2.224–8, no. 819	336n24
<i>CIG</i> 3064	143n15
<i>CIG</i> 3078	143n16
<i>CIG</i> 3083	143n16
<i>Emporio</i> 621	
(Boardman 1967: 244)	270n13
<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> III. 1	
no. 51	336n24
<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> III.	
3 no. 212	265n76,
	336n24
<i>IG</i> I ² 604	336n24
<i>IG</i> I ³ 10, ll. 6–11	163
<i>IG</i> I ³ 19	167n38
<i>IG</i> I ³ 70	165n31
<i>IG</i> I ³ 127	160n13
<i>IG</i> I ³ 269, l. 36	124
<i>IG</i> I ³ 1163.34–41 =	
153*** Leurini	336n24
<i>IG</i> I ³ 1335	168
<i>IG</i> II ² 43	161n15
<i>IG</i> II ² 1745	152n68
<i>IG</i> II ² 2311	190n41
<i>IG</i> V 1,1 ll. 9–10	164
<i>IG</i> XII.ix 189	190n41
<i>SEG</i> 10.76	165n31
<i>SEG</i> 16.497, Chios	
Museum Inv. 677 =	
154g*** Leurini	150n51
<i>SIG</i> 703.6	193n52
<i>SIG</i> 1013.12	170

* * *

Vase-Paintings

<i>ABV</i> 76.1, Florence 4209	141n9
<i>ABV</i> 144.7, London B210	147n36,
	150n57
<i>ARV</i> ² 3.2, Louvre, Paris G1	189n38
<i>ARV</i> ² 252.52, Berlin 2179	148n39
<i>ARV</i> ² 383.199,	
Boston 26.61	189n38
<i>ARV</i> ² 594.62,	
Boston 97.370	190n39
<i>ARV</i> ² 972.2,	
Vienna 1773	148n38
<i>ARV</i> ² 1038.1,	
Ferrara VT T617	203
<i>ARV</i> ² 1040.14,	
Athens 15299	168n41
<i>ARV</i> ² 1134.7,	
London E370	287n15
<i>ARV</i> ² 1153.17,	
Syracuse 30747	152n70
<i>ARV</i> ² 1154.29,	
Naples 2369	153n71
<i>ARV</i> ² 1314.16,	
Ruvo, Jatta 1538	204
<i>Emporio</i> 734	
(Boardman 1967: 160)	270n13
<i>LCS</i> Suppl. III	
275 no. 46g, Lipari	
inv. 2297	244n7
London B260 (<i>CV4</i>	
Br. Mus. 4, pl. 64,	
1a (209))	190n39
Staatliche Museen	
zu Berlin inv. 3414	287n15

GREEK INDEX

ἄβρα	253	βακκάρις	277, 287n17,
ἄβρος	253n33		309n34
ἄγιος	313n44	βαρύς	272n21
ἄγνυμι	313, 314	βαρύφθογγος	274n27
ἀγορά	198n70, 224n19,	βασιλεύς	217, 221, 222,
	237		237n70, 238
ἄγριος	258	βοή	217, 232, 272,
ἀδιάπτωτος	267		288n20
ἀερσίγυιον	309n34	βόρειος	275, 286n10
ἀερσίνοος	270, 309n34	βοῦς	213
ἀερσίπους	270		
ἀερσίφρων	270	γελάω	239
ἄζομαι	313n44	γενεαλογέω	331n1
αἰών	238	γράφω	19n11, 30, 42n49
ἱακίς	70	γραῦς	103n92
ἀκίσσαρον	70		
ἄλεκτωρ	210, 252, 333n8	δακτυλωτός	259, 260, 310n35
ἄληθής	227, 228	δεινός	103
ἄμέλγω	234	δεξιός	173, 183, 227
ἄμεργω	234n54	δημότικος	137
ἄμφαδόν	269	διαυγής	308, 309
ἄμφιθετος	260	διθυραμβοδιδά-	
ἄναξ	198n70, 237,	σκαλος	18, 18n7, 32, 33, 39
	237n70, 238	δίκαιος	217, 239, 239n77, 240
ἄνθρωπος	227, 235n56,	δίκη	239, 240
	246n16	δίοπτρον	236
ἄνθρωπος	193, 235, 235n56,	δοξοκοπέω	100
	236	δοξοκοπία	100, 119
ἄνθρωπος	270	δυνατωτάτος	123
Ἀντεξηγήσις	48n14, 283		
Ἀοῖος	33, 34, 37, 266	ἐγκριθέντες	55
ἄπαξ	32, 40	εὔπερ	306
ἄπειρόκαλος	118n24	ἐκλιπής	88n53
ἀποδημέω	76n5, 319, 326n32	ἔκπωμα	259, 259n61, 260
ἀποκαλέω	102	Ἑλληνας	195n58, 198n70
Ἀπόλλων	265, 290	Ἑλληνικός	94n67
ἀπομνημονεύω	95n68	ἐμμαπέως	70, 270
ἀπύρωτος	259	ἐμμελής	101, 127, 132
ἀρετή	32, 128, 239, 240,	ἐνδιαεραιε-	3
	267, 297, 298	ρινήχεται	33
ἀριστοκρατία	119n31	ἐορτή	286
ἄριστος	120, 223n14	Ἑξηγητικός	48n14
αὖθις	97n75	ἐπιγράφω	35n37, 312
αὐλός	210, 272, 288n20	ἐπίδειξις	193n52
αὐτοφυής	234, 234n52, 235,	ἐπίδειξις	193n52
	237, 238	ἐπιδειξιός	173, 183, 227
ἄφεγγής	308, 309	ἐπιδημέω	76n5, 327
ἄχραντος	259, 260	Ἐπιδημία	22, 85n39

ἐπίδημος	166n36	μαγαδίζω	273n23
ἐπήρανος	217, 238, 238n73, 304n25, 343n62	μάγαδις	272, 273, 288n20
ἐπινίκιον	243n4	μεγαλαυχία	127, 129
ἐπίσημος	166, 166n36	μεγαλοφροσύνη	104, 105
ἐπιτραγῳδέω	102	μειράκιον	174, 226
ἐρωτικώτατος	72n32, 132, 244n5	μεμουςωμένος	101, 127, 132
ἐτερόζυγος	95, 96n72	μεσόμφαλος	277, 288n22
εὐγενής	120	μεταφορά	210n15
ἐχθαίρω	250, 251n29	μετέωρος	33, 37, 312
ἐχυρός	162	μέτρον	223n14
θαλία	198n70, 237n70	μισέω	230
θίασος	282, 288n25, 386	μνᾶμα	230
ἡνορέα	270	μνημονεύω	29, 34, 36, 95n68
ΗΦΑΙΣΤΗΣ	168	μόθαξ	101, 129, 129n59
ἱπίσκος	291n37	μόθος	129
ἵππος	286n10	μόθων	101, 128, 129, 129n59
καλλιγραφέω	267	μοθωνικός	100, 101, 127, 128, 129, 131
καλὸς κάγαθός	120, 193, 235n55	Μοῦσα	199n73
καλχαίνω	214, 215	μουσικῶς	98n79
κάλη	214	νέος	319, 319n3, 326n32
κάρπιμος	234	νευρή	274n27
κατάφρακτος	209	νίφας	258
κελαρύζω	269	νιφόμεναι	207, 257, 257n49, 258, 259, 260
κεράμειος	37, 38, 38n40, 271	νύσσω	338
κόρη	211	ξένος	234
κοσμέω	87n52	ξυμποσία	219
Κοσμολογικός	35, 312	ξυμπότης	219
κόσμος	312	ξυνουσία	219
κότυλος	310n35	οἶνος	69n25, 227, 227n29, 236, 238, 278
κράτος	32, 297, 304	οἶνον	69n25, 212, 213
κρίνω	90	ὄλβιος	235
κτίζω	12n51, 65n7, 147, 170	ὄλος	79n18, 306
κυδρ-	270	ὀμματογράφω	278, 287n18
κυδρός	270	ὀμιλία	118, 118n26, 129, 131
κυδρότερος	221, 270	ὀράω	85n39
κυμαίνω	306	ὀρθῶς	219, 227n29
κύπελλον	277, 288n22	ὀρίγανον	70, 270, 386
λάλη	170	ὀρίζω	302
λάξις	170	ὀρτή	279, 286
λήξις	170	Ὀρφικά	340n45
λόγιος	229	οὐρανός	65, 257n50
λογογράφος	87n51	ὀφθαλμός	235
λόγος	3, 32, 34, 36, 37, 229, 310n35, 314	ὄχλος	137
λόγη	50n22, 59, 139, 140n3, 142, 142n14, 144, 154, 169, 170, 388	παιδεία	227n29
λυρικός	36, 246	παίζω	33, 34, 37, 43n57,

	217, 221, 224, 230, 239	σάγη	280n35
παῖς	150n51, 227, 232	σέβω	106
παλαιθέτος	333n8	σελήνη	207n5
παλαιός	46, 199n73, 246, 297	σεληνοπετής	17n4, 310n35
Πανελλήνιος	198n70, 217, 224n19, 235, 237	σεμνός	106n99, 299
παντοδαπός	224n19, 229	σεμνότης	100, 106, 119
παρακαλέω	102	σιγάω	250, 251n29
παρακινδυνεύω	267	σιωπάω	232
πατήρ	222, 230, 237	σοφία	307, 330
παύω	232	σοφιστής	46, 246, 297
Πελιναῖον	170n48	σοφός	123n44, 238n73, 304n25, 343n62
Πέλοψ	175n58, 275, 277, 287n17	σοφώτατος	117
πεπαιδευμένος	192, 193	σπανοπώγων	342n54
Περί	23n18, 25, 29, 33, 37, 55n39, 170n48, 239n78, 244n5, 312, 315, 316n53	σπουδή	239, 239n80
περιβόητος	43n57, 36, 35, 33, 345n77	στάσις	220
πίνω	170n48, 217, 221, 224, 230, 239	στίμμις	278, 287n18
πί[ν]ω	69n25	στρατηγέω	173
πίπτω	65	στυγητός	258
ποιέω	79n16	σύγγραμμα	30, 297, 299, 317
ποιητής	29, 33, 34, 43n57, 58, 127, 140n3, 170n48, 244n5, 246, 361n53	συγγραφέυς	58, 140n3, 246
πολυειδεία	40, 246, 265	συγγραφή	140n3, 247
πολύμητις	255	συμπόσιον	38n41, 219, 237, 239, 240
πολύτροπος	255	συμπότης	193, 219, 230
πόνος	235, 235n55, 235n57	συμφέρον	239n77
πορφύρα	214	συνδειπνέω	172
πορφύρεος	214, 214n24, 215	Συνεκδημητικός	22
πορφύρω	214, 214n25, 215	σύνεσις	32, 297, 304
πραττομένος	55	συνθέτης	33, 37, 310n35
Πρεσβευτικός	33, 35	συνοπαδός	175n58
πρεσβεύω	230, 237, 238	σύντροφος	129
πρόφασις	229	συρίζω	252n32
πρυτανεῖον	94n67	σχηματογράφω	311n37
πρύτανις	212, 237	σφεδανός	220
Πυθαγόρεια	340n45	σῶμα	209, 308
πυκνός	232, 233, 278n33	σωτήρ	222
πῦρ	259	τέλειος	308
ῥεκτήριος	123n44	τι	298, 315, 317
ῥιγεδανός	258, 259	τόνος	271
ῥιγέω	258	τραγικός	36, 43n57, 58, 246
ῥίγος	207	τραγωδοποιός	55n39, 58, 228
		τρεῖς	32, 55n39, 170n48, 297, 298, 302, 313n44
		Τριαγμοί	31, 297, 312, 312n41
		Τριαγμός	21, 30, 297, 312, 312n41, 313, 314, 330
		τριάζω	311n38, 313
		τριακτήρ	314

τριάς	32, 297, 298, 302, 313, 313n44, 314	φιάλη	259, 260, 277, 310n35
Τριασμοί	313	φιλομεῖραξ	23
τριάσσω	313	φιλοπότης	72n32, 132, 244n5
τριγμός	313	φιλόσοφος	30, 34, 36, 58n47, 246, 297, 298, 317
τρίμιτος	291n37	φοβερός	258
τρίπους	313	φόβος	209, 236n64
τρισμός	313	φρονέω	103, 105, 239, 240
τριστοίχος	269, 278, 278n33	φρόνημα	105
τρυφή	223	Φρούροι	207, 253
τύφος	100, 119	φύσις	238, 303, 312
τύχη	32, 297, 304, 330	φωνέω	232
ὕγρός	101, 127, 131, 132n68	ψάλλω	180, 195n57, 198, 199, 272
ὕγροτης	132	ψάλτρια	197, 272, 288n23
ὕελοιδής	308, 309n33	ψευδής	228, 228n22
ὕμνος	333n8	ψυχή	209, 209n13, 258
ὕπάγω	227		
ὕπερφιάλος	269	χαίρω	238
Ἵπομνήματα	22, 35	χαρακτηρίζω	48, 327n33
ὕπόπτερος	209	χελιδών	209
ὕπότυφος	100, 127, 129, 131	Χίος	58n48, 257
ὕποχθόνιος	234n52	Χῖος	32, 38n40, 43n57, 150n51, 246, 246n16, 265, 267n58
φαναῖος	290		
φαρμακός	235, 236n64, 237, 238	χιτὼν	209
φαῦλος	79n16	χιών	65, 257
φερέσβιος	280, 280n35	χρηστός	120, 123, 132, 227, 227n28, 235n55
φέρω	315		

GENERAL INDEX

- Abantes 65
 abstractions 9, 232, 310, 314, 332,
 334n15, 337n26, 342, 345n75
 Abydos 166
 Achaea 215
 Achaemenids 309n33
 Achaeus 56, 63, 287n17, 289, 290
 Acamas 148, 152
 Achilles (hero) 84, 84n35, 168, 249,
 255n41, 258, 259
 Achilles (son of Ion?) 10n40, 67n16,
 150n51, 165, 165n32, 166
 Achilles Tatius 291n39
 Acragras 38, 317n54
 Adam 32n34
 Adrastus 333
 adultery 151, 197
 Aegina 113n10, 164
 Aelian 10n45, 11n45, 48, 72n32,
 119n27, 130n62, 132, 139n1, 145n29,
 170n48, 174, 223n15, 234, 244n5,
 269, 316n53
 Aelius Aristides 63
 Aeolic dialect 170n48
 Aeolus (Boeotian) 143, 144
 Aeschines 2n7, 141n4, 341n51,
 345n75
 Aeschylus 23, 42n52, 47, 55, 56,
 98, 108, 149n48, 150n54, 185n23,
 196n60, 199, 199n74, 204, 209,
 248n21, 256n43, 259n60, 266, 269,
 280n35, 287n17, 289, 314, 344n70
 canon and 47, 55, 56, 56n39, 56n42
 elegies 42n52, 78
 Ion and 2, 2n8, 5, 20, 24, 35n37,
 56, 56n42, 90n58, 108, 120, 150,
 172n54, 269, 280n35, 309n34, 338
 Aesop 201
 aetiology 11n48, 292
 Aëtius 60, 60n58, 308, 309, 315n46,
 342n53
agalma 334, 334n15
 Agamemnon 103–4, 128, 145n26, 215
 Oinotrophoi and 145n26
 Pericles' comparison with 103–4,
 128
Agamemnon (Ion's) 2, 3n12, 31, 48n14,
 52, 52n31, 70, 248, 259, 310n35
 Agathon 55, 63, 79n17, 239n80,
 243n4, 337n29
 Agelaus 283
 Agelos 65
 Agesilaos 131
 Agis 51, 101
agma 17
 Agon (personification) 339n38
agones (contests/games) 90, 108, 120,
 134, 153, 185, 189–94, 205, 231n41,
 245n11, 262–5, 271, 314, 331,
 336n21, 338–9
 Carneian 187
 chariot-racing 38, 120–1, 121n39,
 264, 264n72, 335, 335n18, 339n41
 Delphic 265, 265n75
 democratization of 184n18, 185,
 188, 190–2, 204–5, 264, 264n71
 Great Dionysia 20, 68, 159, 164,
 234, 244n8, 261–4, 283, 339n37
 Isthmian 2, 2n8, 20, 172n54, 338
 musical and tragic 2, 20, 24, 37–8,
 66, 187–92, 193n52, 194, 198n70,
 204–5, 234, 246, 261–5, 270–1,
 282–3, 328, 334n15, 337n24, 339
 Olympic 38, 78, 336, 338, 338n33,
 339n36
 Panathenaic 189–90, 190n41,
 198n70
 prizes at 2, 20, 24, 26, 190n41,
 193n52, 227n27, 259, 263–5, 271,
 337n24
 sporting 38, 120, 259, 335n18, 339
 agora 165, 237, 332n5
 Aias 67n13, 141, 141n8, 142, 144,
 255n41
ainigma 201, 202, 202n87
ainos 202, 202n87
akissaros 70
akme 344n70
 Alcaeus 108, 194, 218, 220, 227, 233,
 235n59, 236, 238, 257, 257n50
 Alcibiades 38, 38n41, 86, 89, 99,
 107n106, 185n22, 203, 250, 251,
 263n68, 268n6
 Alcidamas 145n29
 Alcmaeon 28
 Alcmaeonids 130

- Alcman 197, 273, 331n1
 Alcmene 221, 222, 248n19
Alcmene (Ion's) 2, 209, 248, 274,
 280n35, 284n6
Aletheia 228n34
alethes 228n30
 Alexander of Aphrodisias 303
 Alexander of Macedonia 182
 Alexander Rhetor 334n11
 Alexander the Great 38, 38n41, 55n39
 Alexandria 4, 27–8, 47, 247n17,
 298n7, 312, 316
 Library of 27, 29, 31, 35, 39n42,
 47, 55, 62, 312
see also Ion s.v. Alexandrian criticism
Alkmaionis 248n21
 Allatios, L. 70–1
 altars 94, 265, 331–2, 334, 336,
 339n38, 345, 345n75
 Althaea 150n56, 151
 Amphiklos 65
 Anacharsis 219
 Anacreon of Teos 107–8, 143n16,
 144n23, 147n36, 185n22, 194, 220n5,
 273
 Anacreontic vases 194
 Anastasia the Martyr 32n34
 Anaxagoras 89n54, 101, 304, 309, 325
 Anaximander 300n15, 325, 341n47
 Anaximenes 325, 341n47
 Andron of Ephesus 313, 315
 anecdote 5, 10–11, 20, 23, 23n19,
 36, 49, 56, 77n5, 90n57, 90n58, 93,
 93n64, 112, 114–6, 118, 120, 124–6,
 145n29, 154, 173n61, 183, 187,
 187n31, 188n33, 200n77, 219, 234,
 243–6, 262–3, 265n74, 269, 269n8,
 271, 309n34, 319n1, 320–3, 324n23,
 325, 326n27, 329n40, 338, 338n33
 Anion 145n28
 Anios 145
Antigone (Ion's) 12
 Antigonus 322n12
 Antimachus 333, 333n9, 335n18
 Antiphanes 231
Omphale 291
 Antiphon 122n41, 239n78
 Antony 89, 99, 291n35
Aeios (dithyramb) 32–4, 83n30, 267,
 342
 Apaturia 193n52
 Aphrodite 113, 251, 251n29
apodeixis 302n21
apodemia 6, 319n1, 320, 325, 326n32,
 330
 Apollo 10n43, 40, 145, 183n14,
 190, 191, 204, 204n94, 238, 246n16,
 290
 inventor of lyre 191n45
kitharoidos 189–90, 190n39, 203–4
 of Phanai 290
 Oulios 142
 Apollodorus 141n8, 143n18, 145n26,
 145n28, 147n35, 147n36, 151n58,
 151n59, 250n27, 283, 283n3, 284,
 285
 Apollonides of Nicaea 31, 49n15, 298,
 298n6, 312
 Apollonius of Rhodes 143n18,
 144n22, 145n28, 147n35, 147n36,
 258, 258n58
ktiseis 247n17
 Apollonius Sophista 96n72
 apophthegmata 5
 Arcadia 44, 143n19
 Arcesilaus 48n13, 322n12, 326n32,
 327n33
 polymathy of 327
 studied Ion 48, 327n33
 Archelaus 319–330
 Ion and 2, 5, 5n26, 6, 24, 120,
 120n34, 321n8, 323
 Melissus and 321n9, 328
 Samian expedition and 321n8,
 327
 Socrates and 6, 20n14, 319–330
 Archelaus of Macedon 188n33
 Archidamian War 132
 Archidamus of Sparta 8n34, 24,
 49–50, 89n54, 105n97, 120, 221–2,
 222n10
 Archilochus 103n92, 151n64, 244n7,
 249n25, 254, 317, 317n55
 Areion 333n9
arete 98, 100, 128, 240, 299, 305, 310,
 330
Argeioi 2, 70, 248, 249
 Argo 143
 Argos 44, 107n106
 Ariadne 147–148
 mother of Oinopion 64, 144n23,
 147–8
 Arion 56, 56n41
 Aristarchus 21, 31, 48n15, 55, 56n39
 commentary on Ion's *Omphale*
 248n20, 282
 Aristides 93, 94
 Aristides Quintilianus 197n67, 187
 aristocracy 120, 133–4, 137–8, 153,
 237

- Athenian 100, 111, 119n31, 120–7,
 132, 134–8, 263n68, 264, 264n71
 Chian 119n28, 133, 137
 clubs 120n36, 128n57
 musical culture and 183–4, 185n22,
 186, 189, 191–2, 194, 199n75, 202,
 202n88, 203, 205, 205n98
 patronage of poets 121
 Aristophanes (and Schol.) 11n45, 21,
 31, 33, 33n36, 37, 39, 46, 46n5, 55,
 55n39, 79n14, 79n17, 84n37, 94–5,
 97n75, 101, 101n86, 101n88, 105,
 115n15, 135n73, 136, 159, 166,
 167n38, 173n61, 185n23, 197n65,
 211n17, 234, 235n55, 250, 251, 257,
 257n50, 258n57, 266, 279, 335n19
 Chians in 68n20, 159–60, 166,
 166n35, 167
 Ion in 2, 2n10, 2n11, 3n13, 3n16,
 9n39, 10n41, 18, 18n6, 22, 24,
 32–4, 37, 43n57, 45, 45n1, 46n3,
 77, 78n11, 79n17, 83n30, 95n68,
 119n30, 145n29, 167, 209, 209n12,
 234, 243n1, 246n15, 250, 251n31,
 266, 266n1, 270, 283, 298n8,
 298n9, 312, 312n42, 316, 333n8,
 339n35, 339n37, 342, 342n54,
 345n77
 musical culture in 101n86, 183n16,
 184n17, 185n23, 187n29, 192,
 192n47, 193n52, 194, 195n57,
 195n60, 196n60, 197, 199, 199n74,
 203n90, 204
 Aristophanes of Byzantium 50n22, 54,
 55, 56n39
 Ion in 48n15
 Aristotle
 Chios in 226
 Library/Lyceum of 46–7, 290n33,
 312, 315
 metaphor in 210n15, 231–2
 music and literary culture in 21,
 32n35, 45n1, 87n51, 186, 187n29,
 192, 192n48, 195, 210n15, 220,
 225, 231–2, 255n43, 312n39
 numbers in 301–3, 310, 313, 340,
 341n47
 politics 102, 110, 121–2, 124n46,
 127n55, 141n7, 152n67, 226
 philosophy/natural science 59n49,
 60, 60n58, 83n31, 103, 297, 301–3,
 306, 310, 313
 Pseudo-Aristotle 110n1, 121n37,
 122, 124n46, 127n55, 133, 152n67,
 187n29
 Pythagoreans in 301–2, 302n21,
 303, 306, 313, 340, 341n47
 Aristoxenus 271
 Aristoxenus 181n9, 186, 195, 271
 Artemis 332n6
 Oulia 142
 Asclepius 152, 328
 Asius of Samos 151, 151n65, 331n1
 Aspasia 99, 100, 106n99
 as Helen/Hera/Omphale 100,
 100n83, 290, 290n32, 291
 ass 201
 Assyria 309n33
astragalus 343, 343n65, 344
 Astydamos 48, 63
 Athamas 65, 143–4
 Athena 65, 147, 190n39, 270, 340,
 340n47
 Athenaeus 17n4, 38, 38n39, 38n41,
 39, 52, 85n39, 203, 203n91, 219,
 220, 220n5, 222, 231, 231n40, 236,
 238, 244n6, 255n43, 259–60, 287n17,
 290n33, 307, 337n24, 338n33
 Ion in 2n10, 4n18, 5n21, 5n26,
 8n34, 10n41, 10n43, 10n45,
 11n46, 17n4, 22, 23, 31, 31n32,
 35n37, 38, 43, 45n1, 48, 48n14,
 48n15, 49n15, 50, 50n21, 52,
 52n31, 56n42, 68, 68n22, 69,
 69n25, 69n27, 70, 72n32, 77n5,
 82, 90n58, 95n68, 108, 111, 117,
 119n27, 120, 132, 139, 144, 145,
 145n29, 153n73, 154, 170n48,
 172, 172n57, 173, 174, 174n64,
 182n12, 184n20, 185, 196n60, 197,
 197n64, 198, 202, 209–12, 215n27,
 216, 218, 221–2, 223n15, 227,
 231, 234, 237n67, 237n71, 244n5,
 248n20, 249n24, 252, 256n46, 259,
 259n61, 260n62, 265n74, 267–9,
 267, 270–2, 272n21, 277–9, 282–3,
 286–8, 304n25, 309n34, 310n35,
 316, 316n53, 317, 321n8, 333n8,
 337n29, 339n37, 343
 music in 185, 185n22, 197, 197n64,
 210, 252, 272, 272n21, 273, 282–3,
 286, 288, 288n22, 333n8
 wine-cups in 259–60, 277–8, 288,
 288n22, 310n35
 Athens 7, 20, 25, 30, 38, 42n49,
 42n52, 46–7, 49, 64–5, 67n16, 68,
 75, 77n5, 82–4, 84n35, 86, 88n53,
 92, 93n64, 93n65, 94, 94n67, 95,
 95n70, 96n71, 97, 97n77, 99n81,
 103, 103n91, 101–2, 104, 104n93,

- 106–7, 107n106, 108, 110–2, 112n5,
116–7, 122–3, 125, 125n50, 126–7,
129, 129n60, 132–8, 141–2, 146,
148–50, 152, 155–175, 179–205,
219–20, 224n19, 225–7, 234, 239n77,
240, 244, 244n8, 245, 251, 261, 265,
321, 323n19, 327–8, 330, 334n11,
336, 338n32, 344, 345n75
Acropolis 152, 336n24
Agora 165, 332n5
allies 7, 12, 23, 67–8, 76, 77n5,
88n53, 90–4, 97, 103, 103n92,
117, 119, 123–5, 133, 136–8,
140, 146, 161–2, 162n17, 166–7,
167n38, 174, 225–6, 234n54, 240,
265, 281
as centre/destination 75, 94n67,
170, 172n55, 330, 336, 338n32
Asklepion 152
Assembly 20, 111, 122, 126, 132–5
autochthony 137, 171, 171n49,
234n52
Chios and 8, 66–8, 106–9, 137,
140, 146–54, 155–75, 225–6,
236–40, 268
dithyramb and 2, 12, 20, 24, 24n22,
25, 29, 32–6, 39, 42, 56, 77–8,
79n16, 83n30, 182, 185, 186n27,
195n58, 204n94, 245, 245n11,
245n12, 246, 262–3, 264n71,
270–1, 298n8, 333n8, 339n37, 342,
342n54, 343
empire/*arche* 7, 8, 66, 75, 103n92,
106–9, 121, 133, 133n70, 136–8,
149, 157–61, 163–5, 167, 167n38,
169, 172–4, 220, 225–6, 261n64
fleet/sailors 91, 93, 102, 117, 126,
159, 159n9, 167, 173n60, 185,
185n23, 190n40, 204, 225, 345n75
foreign poets at 10, 76, 168n39,
185, 243, 245–6, 261–2
Four Hundred 117n22
Great Dionysia 20, 68, 159, 164,
234, 244n8, 261–4, 283, 339n37
Ion and 2, 2n5, 2n7, 2n8, 5, 7–12,
19, 19n12, 20, 23–5, 36–8, 45–6,
66–8, 77, 88–109, 110–2, 115–7,
119n30, 120, 120n31, 120n32, 124,
127, 129, 137–8, 140, 146–9,
155–75, 183–5, 188, 217–240,
243–65, 268, 268n7, 269–71, 281,
284, 320, 320n6, 321n8, 329–30,
336
Ionia and 30, 38, 42, 66, 103–4,
108–9, 112n5, 117, 128, 138, 142,
143n16, 146, 146n32, 162, 166,
168, 171, 173–4, 225–6
Kerameikos 168
metics 136, 261, 271
Metroön 47
monetary affairs at 91, 102, 117,
121–2, 126, 133, 146, 164, 167,
173n61, 190, 225, 262, 263n70,
264
music at 9, 157, 179–205, 271–4
mythology 11–2, 30, 66, 67n13,
137, 141–2, 146–54, 171–2,
234n52, 290
Odeion 184n18, 190, 190n40, 192,
204
Oeneis/Oeneidae 151–3
oligarchy and 110–1, 118n26,
119–127, 129, 131–4, 136–8
Painted Stoa 149n48
Parthenon 113, 114n10
Pentekontaetia 88n52, 110n1
Philaidae 142, 345n75
philosophy/intellectual life at 6–9,
11, 13, 20, 22, 42n49, 46, 75, 78,
80n20, 107, 121, 126, 126n53, 179,
188, 192–4, 198, 200–2, 202n88,
203, 206, 215, 223–4, 228, 228n29,
231n41, 318, 319–30, 336–8,
338n32, 344
proxenoi 8n37, 68, 116–7, 124
Samos and 46, 68, 90, 100n84,
102–3, 103n91, 117, 125, 146n31,
160n13, 168, 173n59, 179, 326–8
Second Athenian Confederacy 161,
161n15
Socrates at 6, 22, 108, 319–330
sophists at 76n5, 94n67, 126, 134,
194, 336, 338n30
Theatre of Dionysus 152, 190,
204
theatrokratia 186, 189–194
Theseus and 66, 141, 141n6, 142,
148–9, 149n48
tragedy at 2, 2n7, 2n10, 3, 3n12,
3n13, 3n17, 4, 4n18, 10–1, 13,
17n1, 19n11, 19n12, 20–6, 28–34,
36–8, 40–1, 42n50, 43–6, 48, 52–6,
58, 63–6, 68, 70–1, 75–9, 79n17,
79n18, 81, 100–3, 105, 118, 124,
139, 184n20, 185, 185n22, 185n23,
196, 196n60, 197, 199, 206,
209–11, 216, 227n29, 228, 230,
234–265, 266–81, 271, 282–92,
297, 297n5, 298, 298n8, 301, 309,
310, 310n36, 312n43, 316n50, 318,

- 331n1, 333n8, 334n15, 338n33,
 339n37, 341, 341n51
 tribes 146n31, 152, 153, 264
 athletics 58n49, 153, 336, 336n21,
 339, 343, 343n64
 Atthidographers 110n1, 169, 247n17
 Atticism (dialectic) 49, 50n22, 180n6
 Atticism (political) 127, 158
 Aubrey, J. 115
 Augustine 63, 63n65
 Aulis 145, 255n41, 285
aulos 179, 179n3, 185, 185n22,
 186n27, 187, 187n28, 187n29,
 195n58, 199n74, 200, 201n83
 Ion and 181n10, 185n22, 210,
 272–3, 288n20, 333n8
 as cock 210, 333n8
 foreign players 245, 245n11
 riddles about 201
 Ausonius 344n70
 autobiography 77n7, 82, 113, 243,
 319n1
 autochthony 137, 171, 171n49,
 234n52
 Autolycus 326n32
- Bacchius 54n34
 Bacchus 292; *see also* Dionysus
 Bacchylides 3, 43n57, 64, 108, 141,
 141n10, 148n46, 151n58, 153, 182–3,
 183n14, 267, 316n49, 333n8, 345n75
 Bacon, F. 81, 81n23
 Bakhtin, M. 323–4
 Ion in 324, 324n21
 Balliol 26
barbitos 182–3, 185n22, 194–95,
 195n57; *see also* lyre
basileus 8, 217, 221–5
 Baton of Sinope 10, 10n45, 21, 31,
 48, 72n32, 119n27, 145n29, 244n5,
 316, 316n53
 Bdelycleon 115n15, 235n55
 beards 11, 152–3, 213, 342n54
 Bentley, R. 19n12, 22
 Berlin, I. 317, 317n55
 biography 19n12, 28n29, 29, 42n52,
 75–109, 110n1, 206, 243n2, 267,
 319n1, 320, 326, 329n40
 anecdote and 5, 20, 23, 23n19,
 90n58, 114–6, 246, 322n12, 323,
 325
 genre 6, 75–88, 156–7
 history and/as 6, 75–88, 112n5,
 156–7
- Ion and 3, 5–8, 17n1, 24n22, 29,
 46, 48, 64, 72n32, 75–109, 113,
 115, 236, 243–4, 246, 256, 319n1,
 321, 323–7, 329–30
 Ionian 7, 112–3
 Bios 335n17
bios 19n11, 320
 blushing 118, 215
 Boeotia 143, 143n19, 143n20, 144,
 275
 Boethius 187n31
 books 23–6, 28–9, 31, 36, 42n50, 44,
 46–8, 51–2, 56–7, 61–2, 116, 300n15,
 338
 guide- 8n36, 171
 titles 5, 9, 18, 18n9, 21–2, 23n18,
 28, 30–1, 33, 35, 47, 70, 76–7,
 81n23, 115, 247–8, 249n23, 253,
 296–8, 300, 311–5, 331, 333,
 342n54
 Boswell, J. 115
 Brasidas 83n31, 84
 broom 70
 Brown, A. L. 23, 23n20
 Buthus the Pythagorean 306n28; *see*
also Xuthus
 Byzantium 32n34, 49, 50n22, 54, 56,
 61, 63, 90, 117, 121n37, 174, 226,
 344n70
- Caesar 99
 Caligula 343n65
 Callicles 134
 Callicratidas 130
 Callimachus 17n1, 28–30, 30n31, 32,
 34, 36, 39, 41–4, 254–5
Diegesis 1n3, 39, 40, 43, 48, 58n49,
 78n12, 246n13, 316n51
Hekale 248n20
Iambi 1n3, 19n11, 27–30, 34, 39–1,
 48, 58n49, 78n12
 Ion and 1n3, 4, 17–44, 48, 48n15,
 52, 58n49, 59, 78, 78n12, 248n20,
 265, 297, 306, 316–7
 Ion's *Omphale* in 248n20
Pinakes 4, 27, 28, 28n27, 30, 32–3,
 36–7, 39n42, 42, 44, 47, 52, 55,
 59, 316n51
polyideia/generic versatility 1n3,
 17n1, 29, 34, 40–3, 48, 58n49, 78,
 78n12, 265
 Callistratus 49n15
 Callistratus (*didaskalos*) 159
 Callistratus (sophist) 344n70

- Camillus 98
 Candaules 3n12, 284
 canon/s 4, 26, 45–63, 186, 219,
 254–5, 334n15
 Ion in 21, 23, 25, 42, 45–63, 263,
 315–6
 tragic 21, 25, 56, 56n40, 263
 Canon of Polyclitus 336n22, 343,
 343n66, 344
 Caria 65, 171, 199n74
 Carlyle, T. 81, 81n23
 Cassandra 289, 334n11
 Castor 259
 cattle 38, 96n72, 211–3
 Cecrops 152
 Cecrops (Pythagorean) 30
 centaurs 149n47, 223
 Ceos 64
 Cercopes 285
 Chaeremon 48, 63
 Chaeronea 42n49, 92, 94, 152
 Chamaeleon of Heraclea 185n22
chaos 149n47, 223n14
 Chapman, R. W. 19n12
 chariot-racing 38, 120–1, 121n39, 264,
 264n72, 335, 335n18, 339n41
Charis 240
 Chians 7, 48, 119n28, 129, 133, 137,
 174, 234, 240, 306
 characteristics 67–8
 effeminacy 166, 166n35
 in comedy 68n20, 159–60, 166–7
chion (snow) 65, 71, 257
 Chios 226
 Athens and 8, 66–8, 106–9, 137,
 140, 146–54, 155–75, 225–6,
 236–40, 268
 Bios on 335n17
 Caria and 65, 171
 coinage 164, 164n27
 constitution 119n28, 126, 162,
 162n19, 165, 268
 Crete and 64–5, 142, 144, 146,
 146n32, 171–2
 Delian League and 137, 140, 146,
 154, 163–4, 225
 Delos and 144–5, 151, 154
 Delphi and 65, 265, 337n24
 dialect 70, 169–70, 170n48
 eponym 65, 71, 142, 151, 257
 Euboea and 65, 171
 foundation myths 5, 21–2, 24–5, 35,
 50, 59, 59n50, 65–6, 66n8, 78, 80,
 139–54, 171–2, 247n17, 331n1
 Homer and 10, 70–2, 113, 244,
 244n7, 246n16, 270, 274
 Ion of, s.v.
 Klisis, see *Foundation of Chios*
 Maroneia 244
 Melanos astu 151
 Melas 65, 146n32, 151
 Minoans on 147n33
 monstrous serpent on 11, 139n1
 modern 70–2, 335n17
 Mount Pelinnaion 170, 170n48
 Muses on 218n3
 Mycale, Battle of 163
 Mycenaeans 268
 Oinopion and 12, 12n51, 65–66,
 69, 140, 142–8, 147–8, 150–1, 154,
 171
 [*Oin*] *opioneion* on 147
 oligarchy on 119, 119n28, 124,
 126–7, 132, 136–8, 158, 162
 Palamedes and 144–5, 145n29, 154
 Pelasgian foundation 146n32, 148
 Panionion and 65, 171, 173
 Persia and 162, 162n21, 163n23,
 225, 269
 Phanai 290
 Phaselis and 163–4
 Phrygia and 268
 plants 64n3, 70
 Poseidon and 65, 71, 171, 257
 Procles and 222n11
 proxenoi 8n37, 68, 116–7, 124
 revolt against Athens 46, 158–9,
 161, 226, 244n4
 Rhadamanthys and 145n28
 Samian revolt and 117, 225
 Spartan War Fund and 164
 Strattis, tyrant of 162, 163
 streets of 72
 temples on 270, 290
 Teos and 142–4, 146n32, 151, 154
 Theseus and 12, 12n51, 65–6, 66n9,
 141, 147–9, 171
 Trojan War and 144–5, 154
 walls 165, 226
 wine, s.v.
Chiou Klisis
 Hellanicus of Lesbos *Chiou Klisis* 169
 Ion's, see *Foundation of Chios*
 Choeroboscus 48n15, 70, 270, 277,
 287n18
 Choirilos of Samos 247n17
 Choirios 152–3
choregoi 243n4, 245n11, 262, 263, 264

- chrestos* 120, 123, 132, 173, 184n20,
 227, 227n28, 235n55
 Christ 32n34
chronos 335, 335n17, 339n42
 Chrysilla (courtesan) 31, 174, 269
 Chrysogonus 32n34
 Cicero 56n39, 62n64, 63, 184n17,
 187n31
 Cimon 83, 85, 122
 appearance 117
 Bacchylides on 345n75
 character 20, 90–1, 94, 95, 97n77,
 100, 101, 108, 117n21, 127, 131–2,
 131n67, 132, 183–5, 226
 Eion 2n7, 336n24, 341n51
 Eurymedon 90, 90n57, 345n75
 Ion and 2, 2n7, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 20,
 23, 24, 26, 66, 66n10, 67, 89–97,
 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108, 111,
 111n2, 114, 114n3, 115, 116–7,
 118, 119, 119n29, 120, 120n32,
 124, 125, 127, 131–2, 135, 138,
 140, 149–54, 163, 167, 174, 183,
 184, 185, 223, 226, 227, 227n27,
 269, 269n8, 341n51
 naval commander 341n51
 Oeneid 153
 ostracism 2n7, 26, 89n54
 Philaid 142, 341n51
philopotes 10n45
 Plutarch on 10n45, 23, 89–97, 100,
 101, 103, 103n92, 104, 111, 115,
 118, 125, 132
 politics 90, 93, 94–6, 97, 97n77,
 103, 108, 111, 116, 125, 126, 132,
 138, 174, 184
 music and 90, 91, 92, 117, 183,
 185, 223, 226
 sister Elpinice 89n54, 103, 103n92,
 104, 104n95, 105
 son Lacedaimonios 89n54, 125,
 269n8
 son Thessalos 125, 269n8
 son Oulios (or Eleios) 125, 142,
 269n8
 Sparta and 93n65, 93n66, 95,
 95n69, 95n70, 96, 97n75, 97n77,
 101, 138, 184–5, 185n21, 223
 Theseus and 12, 66, 66n10, 141–2,
 142n13, 341n51
 Thracian mother 125
 Cinaethon 331n1
 clams 11
 Clazomenae 166
 Clearchus 290
 Cleisthenes 110, 115n15, 126, 152,
 153
 Clement of Alexandria 30, 60, 301,
 306, 312–3, 315–6, 340
 Cleobulina 201, 201n83
 Cleomenes 338, 338n33
 Cleomenes of Sparta 51, 101
 Cleon 57, 83, 184n17, 239n77
 Cleonides 9n38, 59n51, 180, 182,
 271–2, 341
 Cleonymus 165
 Cleophon 120n31
 Clytemnestra 255n41, 289
 cocks/roosters 11, 210, 252, 333n8
 Codrus 143n16, 146, 148
 colour 309n33
 Ion and 11, 43, 212–5
 comedy 3n13, 20, 29, 32, 32n34,
 33n36, 39, 44, 52, 55, 79, 79n17,
 79n18, 81, 97n75, 100–1, 102n90,
 128, 159, 159n10, 166, 186, 186n27,
 188n33, 192–3, 195–7, 199, 244n5,
 245n12, 246n16, 290–1, 324n21
 Ion and 3, 5n23, 20–1, 24–5, 29,
 33, 35, 37, 42, 77, 79, 167, 197,
 199, 223, 246, 285, 342n54
 commodification 10, 167, 170, 191,
 244, 245, 245n9, 263, 264, 334n15
 compendia 51
 Conon 38
 Constantinople 49
 cooking 29, 335, 335n18
 Corinth 11, 31, 96, 174, 247n17
 Coronea epigram 336n24
 cosmetics 11, 196, 277, 287, 287n18
 cosmology 301, 304, 312
 elements 28, 60, 297, 301, 301n17,
 304–5, 310, 310n36, 330
 Ion and 9, 21, 28, 30–1, 78,
 295–318, 330; *see also Triagmos*
 Philolaus and 301–2, 303n22, 309
 Pythagorean 30, 59, 200n77, 301–2,
 305–9, 314, 341n49, 342n53,
 342n54
 numbers and 295–318
 cottabus 202
 Crane Dance 141
 Crates 48n15
 Cratinus 196, 196n63, 197
 Omphale 290, 290n32
 Cratinus the Younger 291, 291n37
 Creophylus of Samos 274
Cretan Hymn to the Kóuros 334n15

- Crete 64–5, 141–2, 144, 145n28, 146,
 146n32, 171–2, 275, 334n15
 Cretheus 144
 Critias 48, 63, 79n15, 95, 146n32,
 185n22, 194, 202–3, 229, 324,
 324n21
 generic diversity 79, 246n13
 Critobulus 49
 Critolaus 128
 Croesus of Lydia 71, 107, 112, 283
 Cronus 314
 cross-dressing 12, 196–7, 278, 287,
 290–1
 Croton 107, 306n28
 cultural memory 13, 238, 336n24,
 391n1
 Cyclopes 244, 279, 334
 Cyrus 112, 229
Cypria 144, 145n27
 Cyprus 161
 Cyzicus 51, 121n37
- Damon of Oa 201, 203, 203n90
 dancing 101n86, 128–9, 141, 182n12,
 185, 185n23, 197, 209, 209n13, 217,
 221–3, 288, 336n22
 Deianira 150, 150n56, 280, 289,
 289n27
 deification 345n75
 Delian League 7, 133, 137, 140, 146,
 146n31, 154, 163–4, 225
 Delos 142, 144–5, 151, 154
 Delphi 65, 265n75, 277, 336n24,
 339n35, 343n65
 Chians at 265, 337n24
 Oracle 283, 290
 Demaratids 222n9
 Demetrius of Scepsis 31, 49n15, 298,
 298n9, 312
 Democedes of Croton 107
 democracy 20, 83, 100, 110–1,
 120n31, 120n36, 121–2, 125, 133–4,
 136–8, 149n48, 157, 160n13, 162,
 174–5, 175n66, 184–8, 190, 190n40,
 204–5, 205n97, 237, 243, 243n4,
 245n9, 261n65, 264, 264n71
 Democrates 44
 Democritus 71, 98–9, 309, 312,
 326n32, 337n25
 Demosthenes 46, 46n4, 52, 77, 140n3,
 152, 334n11
 depilation 196–7
 Derrida, J. 319n3
 Dexamenos of Chios 113, 113n9
- dexiotes* 184, 184n20
 dialogue form 5, 23n19, 34, 36, 77,
 115, 318, 320, 320n5, 322n12, 323–4,
 324n21, 325
 dice (*astragaloi*) 343, 343n65, 344
 dictionaries/encyclopedia/lexica 17–44
 ancient 4, 17–44, 51–2, 54n34, 55,
 96n72, 298, 316
 Ion in 10n40, 17–44, 50n22,
 52–4, 58n47, 169–70, 250, 316n50,
 345n77
 modern 4, 17–44, 296n2, 319,
 319n1
 Dictys of Crete 145n26
didaskalos 10, 196–7, 227n29, 231n39,
 236
 Didymus 31, 51, 315
 Ion in 21, 31, 48, 48n14, 52, 259,
 259n61, 283
 Diels, H. 297n5, 309n32, 314
Dike 240, 341n48
dike, *see* justice
 Dinarchus 229
 Dinos Painter 152–3
 Dio Chrysostom 187n31
 Diodorus Siculus 32n35, 84n37,
 95n70, 97n75, 110n1, 145n28,
 146n32, 147n35, 147n36, 150n57,
 151n64, 283n3, 284–5, 338n33
 Diodotus 239n77
 Diogenes Laertius 6, 48n13, 55n39,
 247n17, 298n6, 298n10, 299,
 300n15, 306, 313, 319–30, 322n14,
 328, 336n20, 338n33, 339n42,
 340n46
 Archelaus in 319–30
 epigrams 329, 329n41
 Ion in 5n26, 6, 10n42, 20n14,
 35n37, 48n13, 59n51, 60, 77n6,
 120n34, 200, 270, 301, 305–6, 312,
 316, 319–30, 340
 philosophical journey in 6, 319n1,
 320–1, 324, 326n32, 328, 330,
 338n32
 philosophical succession in 321–2,
 325–6, 328, 330
 Pythagoras in 5n26, 10n42, 59n51,
 60, 200, 301, 305–6, 322n14,
 325n16, 326n27, 326n32, 328–9,
 340
 Socrates in 319–30
 Diogenes of Apollonia 298n10,
 299–300, 304, 309
 Diogenianus 52

- Diomedes 150, 248, 255n41, 256, 256n45
 Dion 337n24
 Dionysius Chalcus 185n23, 202–3, 203n91
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 56n39, 101n88, 103n91, 218, 218n2, 337n25
 Dionysius of Syracuse 338n33
 Dionysius Periegetes 275
 Dionysius Thrax 55n38, 140n3
 Dionysus 46, 69n26, 145, 191, 212, 230, 236n62, 245, 250–1, 263, 266, 289n26, 334n15
 Chios and 64, 69, 144n23
 Great Dionysia 20, 68, 159, 164, 234, 244n8, 261–4, 283, 339n37
 Ion on 217–8, 221, 224, 230, 237–8, 288, 290, 304n25
 Lydia and 288, 292
 Oeneus and 150–3
 Oinopion and 64, 65n3, 144n23, 147, 147n35, 147n36, 148, 150
 Theatre of 152, 190, 204
 wine and 69, 145, 147, 147n36, 150–1, 153, 212, 217, 221, 238, 288
Dissoi Logoi 228, 239n78, 338n30
 dithyramb 2–3, 3n13, 3n16, 12, 20, 24–25, 29, 32–7, 39, 42, 56, 77–8, 79n16, 83n30, 182, 182n12, 185, 186n27, 195n58, 204n94, 245, 245n11, 245n12, 246, 262–3, 264n71, 270–1, 298n8, 333n8, 337n24, 338n33, 339n37, 342, 342n54, 343
 Ion's *Aioios* 32–4, 83n30, 267, 342
 Ion's *Antigone* 12
 dolphins 11, 56
 Dorcis 125
 Dorian mode 187, 187n29, 200
doxa 341n47
 Duris of Samos 102–3

 education 28, 49, 51, 54, 56–7, 85, 85n40, 97n77, 126, 174, 174n63, 183n16, 184, 184n17, 185, 191–2, 192n49, 193, 193n52, 215, 227n29, 231n39, 254n38, 258n57, 297
 Egypt 11, 47n10, 57, 81n22, 210, 287n18, 326n32
 Eion 2n7, 336n24, 341n51
Ekdemetikos 19n12; *see also* *Epidemiai*
 Elea, *see* Olympia
 Elea (South Italy), *see* Velia
 electric guitar 179n2

 elegy 40, 42n50, 42n52, 78–80, 83, 199n75, 201, 203, 333n8, 337n29
 Ion's 3, 5, 8–9, 17n1, 19n11, 21, 24, 24n22, 25, 29, 31, 35, 40–3, 50n21, 59n51, 69–70, 77, 80, 118n24, 140, 147–8, 153n73, 154, 171, 174, 180–2, 185–6, 202–3, 206, 211–3, 217–40, 246, 247n17, 270, 270n15, 271–2, 304n24, 310n35, 333n8, 340, 340n46, 341, 343
 music in 5, 9, 180–2, 185–6, 201–3, 341
 Eleios 125, 142, 269n8
 elements 28, 297, 301, 301n17
 Ion and 28, 60, 297, 304–5, 310, 310n36, 330
 Eleusis 152, 339n36
 Elpinice 89n54, 103, 103n92, 104, 104n95, 105
 Emerson, R. W. 81, 81n23, 319
 Empedocles 28, 38, 38n41, 209, 211n17, 304, 304n24, 304n25, 310n36, 317, 317n54, 323n15, 329n40, 333n8, 338
 poetry and Ion 69n27, 238n73, 297, 297n5, 304n24, 304n25, 343, 343n62
 encomium 42, 42n50, 59, 78, 79n16, 87n51, 182, 200n77, 228
 Ion and 21, 24, 24n22, 29, 35, 77, 246
Encomium to Skythiades 3
endeixis 302n21
Eoeae 331n1
 Ephesus 34, 166, 285, 313, 328, 328n36, 337n24
 Ephialtes 83, 94–5, 119, 126
 Ephorus 84n37, 102–3, 107, 107n102, 110n1, 135n73
 Epiboia 141
 epic 28, 40, 42, 55, 71, 78, 79n16, 80, 81n22, 85, 151, 246n16, 331n1, 338n33
 Ion and 10, 40, 41, 247–62, 270n15
 Epicurus 32n34, 298n10
 Epidaurus 328
epideixis 193, 193n52
epidem- 35n37, 76n5, 109, 111n3, 166n36, 267n3
 Hippocratic corpus and 35n37, 267n3
Epidemiai 2n7, 2n8, 3, 3n16, 4n18, 5n26, 6, 8n37, 10n43, 10n44, 19n12,

- 20n14, 22, 24, 24n22, 25, 33, 35,
 35n37, 46n4, 50n22, 56n42, 58n49,
 68n22, 75–109, 111, 116–9, 120n33,
 120n34, 125, 127–8, 149n51, 150n52,
 167, 172, 172n54, 172n56, 172n57,
 173–5, 183n15, 184, 184n20, 206n1,
 215n27, 223, 226–7, 256n46, 264,
 265n74, 267, 267n3, 268–9, 269n9,
 309n34, 319, 321, 321n8, 323, 325,
 331n1, 337n29, 338, 338n32, 342n54
 Aeschylus in 2, 2n8, 5, 20, 24,
 35n37, 56, 56n42, 90n58, 108,
 120, 150, 172n54, 269, 280n35,
 309n34, 338
 Archelaus in 6, 319–30
 audience 7, 129
 biography 6, 114–6, 322–3
 Cimon in 2, 2n7, 5, 7–8, 10, 12, 20,
 23–4, 26, 66, 66n10, 67, 89–97,
 100–1, 103–4, 106, 108, 111,
 111n2, 114, 114n3, 115–9, 119n29,
 120, 120n32, 124–5, 127, 131–2,
 135, 138, 140, 149–54, 163, 167,
 174, 183–5, 223, 226–7, 227n27,
 269, 269n8, 341n51
 date 5n24
didaskalos in 10, 215, 236
 genre/form 5–6, 17n1, 19n11, 22,
 23n19, 46, 49, 68, 75–88, 115,
 223, 243n2, 300n15, 320–1, 321n7,
 322–4, 324n21, 325, 330, 333n8
 Ion in 6, 8, 12, 68, 115, 321, 329
 language of 6–7, 215
 pederasty in 10, 68, 82, 111, 118,
 118n23, 120, 173, 206, 227,
 227n27, 326n32, 327
 Pericles in 2, 5, 5n26, 7, 20, 24,
 25n23, 46, 68, 82, 89, 89n54,
 99–106, 108, 110–1, 114n13, 115,
 118, 118n25, 119, 123, 127–32,
 138, 175, 184–5, 227, 268n7, 269,
 290
 Socrates in 2, 5, 5n26, 6, 20, 20n14,
 22, 24, 34, 36, 77n6, 108, 115,
 319–330, 338n32
 Sophocles and 2–3, 3n17, 5, 5n26,
 7, 10, 10n40, 11–3, 17n1, 20–6,
 43, 56n42, 66, 68, 111, 111n2,
 114, 116, 117–8, 123–4, 132–3,
 172, 172n58, 173–4, 184n20, 206,
 213, 215–6, 227, 230, 255–7, 260,
 265n74, 266–81, 289, 289n29,
 309, 309n34, 321n8, 324, 337n29,
 341n51
 sympotic setting 5; *see also* Ion and
 symposia
 title 3n16, 19n12, 35n37, 111,
 267n3, 342n54
 Epigenes 30
 Ion and 30, 30n31, 48n15, 310n35,
 316
 Epigonoi 248, 248n21
 epigram 39, 42n50, 78, 150n51, 151,
 180, 329, 329n41, 336n24, 338n34,
 344n70
 Ion and 3, 10n42, 21, 25, 29, 33,
 35, 77, 246, 323n16, 336n24, 340,
 340n46, 343
 epitome 39, 51–2, 60n56
eponymoi 11, 42, 67, 142, 146n31,
 151–2, 152n67, 153, 244
 Eratosthenes 58n49
 Eretria 124, 172n58, 190n41, 231n39,
 236
 Eriboea 141, 141n8
 Erotian 54n34
 Erythrai 124, 172, 172n58, 174
Etymologicum (magnum) genuinum 70,
 269–70, 276, 278, 282, 287
Etymologicum Orionis 50n22, 59, 59n50,
 139, 140n3, 142, 144, 154, 170
 Euanthes 65
 Euboea 11, 65, 171, 274–6, 282
 Euclid 9n38, 59n51, 180, 272, 341
 Euenus 223n14, 335n17
 Eumelos 247n17
 Eunopides 306n29
euphrosune 240, 240n81
 Eupolis 10n45, 68n20, 124n46, 166,
 166n35, 167, 193, 193n52, 197,
 197n67
 Omphale and 290
 Euripides 2n10, 20, 38, 42n52, 46–7,
 55–6, 56n39, 57, 63n69, 64, 64n1,
 68, 68n23, 78, 91, 143n18, 144n22,
 149n48, 150n54, 151n58, 185n23,
 188n33, 196n60, 198n68, 199, 202,
 207n6, 211n17, 213–4, 239n77, 251,
 251n29, 251n30, 251n31, 252n32,
 253, 253n33, 256n43, 257n47,
 258n54, 260, 261, 266, 269, 279n34,
 285, 309n34, 335n17, 337n24,
 339n37
 Ion 11, 21, 146n31, 153, 331n1
 Euripus 275, 282
 Euryalus 248, 255n41
 Eurymedon 90, 90n57, 345n75
 Eurypontids 222

- Eurytidai* (Ion's tragedy) 2, 248, 269–70, 274, 280, 284, 289
 Eurytus 248n19, 274, 275, 279–80, 283, 283n3, 284
 Eusebius 48n15, 313
 Eustathius 38n41, 209, 258, 258n59, 259, 274–5, 277–8, 286–7, 287n18, 288n22
 Euthymides 113n10
 Evagoras of Cyprus 161
 eyes 132n68, 211–3, 217, 232, 234–6, 278, 287, 309n33
 Ezra 32n34

 Fabius Maximus 98–9, 128
 fable 85, 229, 324
 Fabricius 98
 Faunus 292
 fish 44
 food 11, 131, 210, 278
Foundation of Chios (Chiou Ktisis) 3, 4n18, 5, 8, 21–2, 24–5, 35, 50, 65, 78, 139–75
 Athens and 12, 146–54, 168–75
 date 66
 Delos and 144–5, 151, 154
 dialect 59, 142, 169–71
 genre/form 5, 12, 59, 59n50, 65n4, 80, 80n21, 139, 140n3, 156, 169, 171, 247, 247n17, 300n15
 Oinopion and 142–8, 150–1
 Oinotrophoi and 145, 145n26
 Palamedes in 144–5, 154, 170n48
 prose/verse 80, 140, 140n3, 247n17
 Peri Chiou 5n21, 144
 Samos and 151
 Teos and 142–4, 146n32, 151, 154
 Troy in 144–5, 154
 wine in 69n25, 144–5, 150–1, 153
 fowler 11, 210
 fox 317
 Frederick the Great 81n23

 genealogy 11, 82, 86n46, 141–2, 151, 169, 169n46, 284, 320, 323–4, 324n21, 325, 331n1
 Ion on 12–3, 82, 150–1, 171, 331n1
 generic versatility, *see polyeideia*
 giants 223
 genre 1, 4, 5n24, 6, 13, 19, 21–3, 27n26, 29–30, 32–3, 40–1, 42n51, 43n53, 44, 51–61, 64, 72, 76–8, 78n12, 79, 79n17, 79n18, 80, 80n19, 80n21, 81, 81n23, 86n46, 87, 87n50, 112–6, 138–40, 140n3, 156, 169, 182n12, 211, 230, 239n78, 243, 243n2, 245–7, 261, 267, 271, 314, 318, 320n6, 321–4, 324n21, 325, 333n8, 334n15
 Glaukos 44
 Gnesippus 195–6, 196n62, 196n63, 197
gnomai 49, 57, 59, 96n72, 236, 238, 249, 308, 336, 336n20, 337, 337n29
 gods 38, 40, 65, 69, 69n26, 71, 99n81, 100n84, 113, 134, 143, 159–60, 191, 191n45, 204, 214, 218, 221, 222n13, 223, 228n30, 230, 233, 238, 238n73, 258, 266, 289, 309n33, 333, 333n8, 335n17, 339n36, 344n71, 345n75
 gold 71, 91, 190n41, 221, 225, 291, 292, 337n24
 Gorgias 28, 99n81, 134, 336–7, 337n24, 337n25, 338, 338n34, 339n42
Encomium of Helen 59, 228
 Ion and 28, 336, 338
 grapes 65n3, 147, 147n36, 151, 244, 285, 292
 Ion and 211–2, 217, 232, 235, 237–8, 342n53
 Great Dionysia 159, 244n8, 261–4
 Ion at 10, 20, 38, 45, 68, 164, 234, 243, 262–4, 271, 283, 339n37
griphos 201
 guest-friendship/*xenia* 107, 107n104, 124, 172, 175
 Gyges 3n12, 115, 284
 Gylippus 130

habrosune 195
 Hagnon 84
harmonia 181, 186, 341, 341n48, 341n49, 343n66
 harmonic theory 181, 181n10, 187n28, 200–1, 273, 300–1, 308, 343, 344n67
harmonikoi 200, 200n79, 201
 harp 181n10, 194–5, 195n56, 195n57, 195n58, 196–7, 197n64, 197n67, 198–9, 203, 272, 283, 288, 333n8; *see also* lyre
iambuke 197, 197n67
magadis 194, 197n64, 272–3, 273n23, 282, 288
pektis 194–5, 195n58, 273n23
psalterion 272
trigonon 194, 195n60, 197

- Harpocraton 28, 298n7
 Ion in 9n39, 18, 18n5, 28–30, 32n34, 49n15, 52, 52n30, 59, 77, 77n10, 149n51, 282, 288n25, 298, 298n9, 306n28, 312, 314–6, 316n51, 317, 344n72
 Heathrow 319n3
 Hecataeus 80, 80n21, 86n46
 Hector 65, 84, 84n35, 173, 257–9
 hedgehog 43, 249, 317
 Hegesinous 247n17
 Helen 59, 81n22, 228, 235, 290n32
 in Ion 11, 206–16, 250–9
 Hellanicus of Lesbos 88n53, 139n1, 142n12, 143n16, 143n18, 146n31, 146n32, 169
 Helle 143
 Hellenotamiai 122n41, 124, 225
 helots 94, 97n75, 119, 130, 130n65, 185
 hendecachord, *see* lyre
 Hephaistes of Chios 168, 170
 heptachord, *see* lyre
 Heracles 79, 79n14, 91, 151, 244, 274, 274n27
 Athens and 189–90, 190n39
 Deianira and 150n56, 280, 289, 289n27
 Ion and 11–2, 197, 221–2, 248, 248n19, 249, 269, 274–92, 339n39, 341
 Iphitus and 283, 283n3, 289
 Mousikos 189, 190n39
 Omphale and 11, 289–92; *see also* *Omphale*
 Sophocles on 12, 274–81
 Syleus and 285–6, 287n14, 289
 Heraclides of Pontus 55n39, 196n60, 323n14, 323n15, 329n40
 Heraclitus 299, 300n15, 306
 polymathia and 305, 340n46
 Hermes
 Enagonios 331, 336, 336n21, 339, 339n38
 Ion's *Omphale* and 275, 283, 285–6, 286n10, 291n39
 music and 191, 191n43, 191n45, 201n84
 Hermesilaos 68, 124
 Hermippus 244n6
 Hermippus of Smyrna 28n29
 Herodian 42n49, 48n15, 209, 252–3, 277, 282, 287n18
 Herodotus 50n23, 51, 67n14, 71, 76n5, 80, 81n22, 82, 83n31, 84, 84n35, 86, 86n46, 87, 88, 88n52, 93n64, 107–8, 112, 112n4, 112n5, 114, 114n10, 114n11, 115, 117n19, 120n31, 135, 141n4, 143n16, 146n31, 146n32, 152n67, 162n21, 163, 163n22, 225, 229, 235n59, 284, 286n11, 297, 338n33
 Herophytus of Samos 90
 Heropythos of Chios 169n46
 Hesiod 80, 142–3, 143n18, 147, 147n36, 150, 151n58, 200n75, 228, 248n19, 336n20, 345n75
 Hesychius 5n23, 11n46, 32, 38, 44n57, 48n15, 70, 96n72, 207, 209, 248n22, 252, 257, 259, 269–70, 272, 276–7, 282, 288, 288n22, 290, 291n37
 Hieron of Aitna 339n41
 Himerius 344n70
 Hippias of Elis 78–9, 79n14, 80, 94n67, 338, 338n33
hippiskos 291n37
 Hippo 63
 Hippocrates 35n37, 76n5, 267n3, 300n14, 313
 Hippocrates (mathematician) 306n29
 Hippothoön 152
 Histiaea 65, 171
 histor 230n37
 historiography 5, 6, 29, 35, 66, 73–109, 110n1, 112–6, 139, 156–8, 171–2; *see also* biography
 Homer 31, 32n34, 38n41, 55, 57, 79n18, 81n22, 83–4, 84n35, 87, 87n52, 96n72, 98, 122n42, 141, 143, 145n26, 148, 148n40, 148n54, 150n54, 151n63, 204, 209, 212–4, 214n23, 214n24, 214n25, 215, 235, 238, 248, 248n21, 252, 254n36, 257n50, 257n51, 258, 258n52, 258n56, 258n59, 259, 259n60, 260n62, 261, 261n65, 261n66, 278n33, 279n34, 283n3, 283n4, 331n1, 335n17, 344n70
 Chios and 10, 70–2, 113, 244, 244n7, 246n16, 270, 274
 Ion and 10–1, 48n15, 70, 84, 144, 144n22, 246n16, 249, 252–60, 269–70, 277, 310, 310n35, 318, 338n32, 341, 341n51, 342n52
Homeric Hymns 191, 201n84, 246n16
homilia 118, 129–31, 184
 homosexuality 166, 166n35, 197
 Horace 324n21

- Hornblower, S. 18n9, 23n20
 Hyllus 275–6, 289
Hymn to Kairos 3, 5, 9, 232, 331–46
 date 334n15
 hymns 39, 78, 183n14, 205n97,
 205n98, 225n22, 227n27, 237–8,
 331–46
 Cretan Hymn to the Kouros 334n15
 Homeric Hymns 191, 201n84,
 246n16
 Hymn to Kairos 3, 5, 9, 232, 331–46
 Hymn to Number 341n51
 Ion and 3, 5, 9, 21, 24, 24n22, 29,
 35, 77, 246, 272, 288, 331–46
 Orphic Hymns 331n1, 341n51,
 342n54
 Hypatia 32n34
 Hyperides 46, 46n4
 Chiakos 160
hypomnema 298n9
Hypomnemata 19n12, 35n37, 95n68,
 342n54; *see also* *Epidemiai*
- Iamblichus 306n28, 308n31, 313,
 341n47, 343n61
 iambus/iambics 11, 41–2, 42n50,
 42n51, 44, 70, 78, 79n16, 80, 203,
 248, 250; *see also* Callimachus
 Iardanus 284
 Ilion 250; *see also* Troy
 intertextuality 17–44, 235, 284,
 289–90, 343
 Iohannes Alexandrinus 35n37, 267n3
 Iole 279, 284
 Ion (mythological) 11, 42, 67
 Euripides on 11, 21, 153, 331n1
 Ion of Chios
 Aelian and 11n45, 72n32, 132,
 139n1, 145n29, 170n48, 174,
 223n15, 234, 269
 Aeschylus and 2, 2n8, 5, 20, 24,
 35n37, 56, 56n42, 90n58, 108,
 120, 150, 172n54, 269, 280n35,
 309n34, 338
 Agamemnon 2, 3n12, 31, 48n14, 52,
 52n31, 70, 248, 259, 310n35
 agma in 17
 Alcmene 2, 209, 248, 274, 280n35,
 284n6
 Alexandrian criticism and 4, 21, 29,
 31, 35, 39–44, 51–2, 55–6, 333n8
 Allatios and 70–1
 alliteration and 59
 Antigone (dithyramb) 12
 Aoios (dithyramb) 32–4, 83n30, 267,
 342
 Arcesilaus and 48, 327n33
 Archelaus and 2, 5, 5n26, 6, 24,
 120, 120n34, 319–330
 Archidamus and 8n34, 24, 49,
 89n54, 120, 221–2
 Archilochus and 317
 Argeioi 2, 70, 248, 249
 Athenaeus and 2n10, 4n18, 5n21,
 5n26, 8n34, 10n41, 10n43, 10n45,
 11n46, 17n4, 22–3, 31, 31n32,
 35n37, 38, 43, 45n1, 48, 48n14,
 48n15, 49n15, 50, 50n21, 52,
 52n31, 56n42, 68, 68n22, 69,
 69n25, 69n27, 70, 72n32, 77n5,
 82, 90n58, 95n68, 108, 111, 117,
 119n27, 120, 132, 139, 144–5,
 145n29, 153n73, 154, 170n48, 172,
 172n57, 173–4, 174n64, 182n12,
 184n20, 185, 196n60, 197, 197n64,
 198, 202, 209–12, 215n27, 216,
 218, 221–2, 223n15, 227, 231, 234,
 237n67, 237n71, 244n5, 248n20,
 249n24, 252, 256n46, 259, 259n61,
 260n62, 265n74, 267–72, 272n21,
 277–9, 282–3, 286–7, 287n17, 288,
 288n22, 288n23, 304n25, 309n34,
 310n35, 316, 316n53, 317, 321n8,
 333n8, 337n29, 339n37, 343
 Athenophile 8, 66, 110, 218, 233
 Athens and 2, 2n5, 2n7, 2n8, 5,
 7–12, 19, 19n12, 20, 23–5, 36–8,
 45–6, 66–8, 77, 88–112, 115–7,
 119n30, 120, 120n31, 120n32,
 124, 127, 129, 137–8, 140, 146–9,
 155–75, 183–5, 188, 217–240,
 243–65, 268, 268n7, 269–71, 281,
 284, 320, 320n6, 321n8, 329–30,
 336
 Atticism 49, 50n22, 180n6
 Bakhtin and 324, 324n21
 barbarian voices in 209
 biography and 3, 5, 5n25, 6–8,
 17n1, 24n22, 29, 46, 48, 64,
 72n32, 75–109, 113, 115, 236,
 243–4, 246, 256, 319n1, 321–7,
 329–30
 birth 1, 2n5, 2n7, 3, 19, 24, 112,
 119, 126, 162, 162n20, 261
 Callimachus and 1n3, 4, 17–44, 48,
 48n15, 52, 58n49, 59, 78, 78n12,
 248n20, 265, 297, 306, 316,
 316n51, 317

- canon and 21, 23, 25, 42, 45–63,
 263, 315–6
 celebrity 33, 35–6, 43n57, 345,
 345n77
 Chian-ness 7, 8, 10, 223–4
 Chios and 2, 7, 19–20, 22, 24,
 29, 35, 43n57, 50, 59, 64–72, 77,
 77n5, 78, 82, 90–1, 91n60, 92, 97,
 106, 109, 111, 117, 119, 126–7,
 132, 139–54, 155–75, 221, 224n19,
 226–7, 234, 238, 244, 244n4, 257,
 270, 281, 290, 301, 306, 320
 Chios (modern) and 70–2
 Chrysilla and 31, 174, 269
 Cimon and 2, 2n7, 5, 7–8, 10, 12,
 20, 23–24, 26, 66, 66n10, 67, 89–
 97, 100–1, 103–4, 106, 108, 111,
 111n2, 114, 114n3, 115–9, 119n29,
 120, 120n32, 124–5, 127, 131–2,
 135, 138, 140, 149–54, 163, 167,
 174, 183–5, 223, 226–7, 227n27,
 269, 269n8, 341n51
 comic poet 3, 5n23, 21, 24–5, 29,
 33, 35, 77, 79, 246, 342n54
 commentaries on 21, 30, 30n31,
 31, 48, 48n14, 48n15, 50, 72n32,
 248n20, 259, 283, 310n35, 316,
 316n53
 compound words 37, 310, 310n35
 Coronea epigram 336n24
 cosmology and 9, 21, 28, 30–1, 78,
 295–318, 330
 cups in 11, 52, 170, 225, 259–60,
 277–8, 287–8, 288n22, 310n35
 Dawn/Morning Star 32–4, 37,
 83n30, 267, 342
 death 2, 2n11, 19, 19n12, 46–7, 61,
 83n30, 127, 168, 180, 188, 226,
 251n31, 330
 dialect in 6, 6n28, 7, 70, 78n12,
 112, 169–70, 170n48, 336n24
 dictionaries/encyclopedia/lexica
 on 10n40, 17–44, 50n22, 52–4,
 58n47, 169–70, 250, 316n50,
 345n77
dike (justice) and 69, 218, 238–40
 Diogenes Laertius and 5n26, 6,
 10n42, 20n14, 35n37, 48n13,
 59n51, 60, 77n6, 120n34, 200,
 270, 301, 305–6, 312, 316, 319–30,
 340
 Dionysiac cult and 69
 Dionysus and 217–8, 221, 224, 230,
 237–8, 288, 290, 304n25
 dissent in 7, 218, 234
 dithyrambographer 2, 3, 12, 20, 24,
 24n22, 25, 29, 32–6, 77, 83n30,
 182n17, 245–6, 262, 267, 270,
 298n8, 339n37, 342
 editions 1, 1n2
Ekdemetikos 19n12; *see also Epidemiai*
 elegist 3, 5, 8–9, 17n1, 19n11, 21,
 24, 24n22, 25, 29, 31, 35, 40–3,
 50n21, 59n51, 69–70, 77, 80,
 118n24, 140, 147–8, 153n73, 154,
 171, 174, 180–2, 185–6, 202–3,
 206, 211–3, 217–40, 246, 247n17,
 270, 270n15, 271–2, 304n24,
 310n35, 333n8, 340, 340n46, 341,
 343
 elements in 28, 60, 297, 304–5, 310,
 310n36, 330
 Empedocles and 69n27, 238n73,
 297, 297n5, 304n24, 304n25, 343,
 343n62
 encomiast 3, 21, 24, 24n22, 29, 35,
 77, 246
 epic and 10, 40–1, 247–62, 270n15
Encomium to Skythiades 3
Epidemiai, s.v.
 epigram-writer 3, 10n42, 21, 25, 29,
 33, 35, 77, 246, 323n16, 336n24,
 340, 340n46, 343
 epithets 4, 4n18, 6, 28–9, 40, 58,
 58n47, 58n48, 59, 91, 91n60,
 98–102, 246, 297, 310, 312n43,
 331n1
erotikotatos 72n32, 132, 223n15,
 244n5, 269
 ethics and 305–6
Eurytidai 2, 248, 269–70, 274, 280,
 284, 289
 family 2, 29, 30, 32n34, 46, 66,
 119, 120, 124, 132, 137, 163, 165,
 243
 father Orthomenes/Xuthus 29–30,
 37, 67, 149n51, 269n8, 306,
 306n28, 313, 342n54, 343
 first tragic production 2n7, 2n10
 foreigner 8, 10, 157, 172, 175, 243,
 245–6, 261
Foundation of Chios (Chiou Ktisis), s.v.
 genealogy and 12–3, 82, 150–1,
 171, 331n1
 generic versatility/*polyeideia* 1, 1n3,
 3–4, 11, 13, 24, 48, 53–4, 58–9,
 64, 77–8, 115, 246, 316n51, 317–8,
 327n33

- genre and 4, 4n18, 42, 218–9,
 316n51, 317
 Gorgias and 28, 336, 338
 Great Dionysia and 10, 20, 38, 45,
 68, 164, 234, 243, 262, 264, 271,
 283, 339n37
 Gyges and Candaules in 3n12
 hapaxlegomena in 10, 276, 315,
 341n51
 harmonic theory and 181, 181n10,
 200, 200n78, 271–2, 343
 Harpocration on 9n39, 18, 18n5,
 28–30, 32n34, 49n15, 52, 52n30,
 59, 77, 77n10, 149n51, 282,
 288n25, 298, 298n9, 306n28, 312,
 314–6, 316n51, 317, 344n72
 Helen and 11, 206–16, 250–9
 Heracles 11–2, 197, 221–2, 248,
 248n19, 249, 269, 274–92, 339n39,
 341
 Heraclitus and 305, 340n46
 Hermes and 275, 283, 285–6,
 286n10, 291n39
 historiography and 5, 6, 66, 73–109,
 156–8, 171–2
 Homer and 10, 10n42, 11, 48n15,
 70, 84, 144, 144n22, 235, 246n16,
 249, 252–60, 269–70, 277, 310,
 310n35, 318, 338n32, 341, 341n51,
 342n52
Hymn to Kairos 3, 5, 9, 232, 331–46
 hymn-writer 3, 5, 9, 21, 24, 24n22,
 29, 35, 77, 246, 272, 288, 331–46
Hypomnemata 19n12, 35n37, 95n68,
 342n54; *see also* *Epidemiai*
 imagery 206–40
 innovator 5, 6, 9, 59, 268, 271–2,
 333n8
 inscriptions 2n7, 336n24, 341n51
 inter-state relations and 8, 12,
 110–138, 155–75
 Ion of Ephesus and 34, 328
 Isocrates and 28, 28n28, 29–30,
 46, 46n3, 59, 60n58, 297, 305–6,
 312n42, 316, 318, 330n45, 344n72
 Isthmian games and 2, 2n8, 20,
 172n54, 338
 Ithome 120, 222n9
Kaineus, *see* *Phoenix/Kaineus/Oeneus*
kairos and 331–46
kratos in 32, 132n69, 297–8, 304,
 344n72
Laertes 2, 70, 209, 248
 Lamachus and 150
logios in 229
 Lydia and 11–2, 91, 197, 210, 272,
 272n22, 273, 275, 277, 279, 282–5,
 287–91, 333n8
 lyre and 5, 9, 90, 157, 180–5, 188,
 198–203, 205, 223, 226, 271–3,
 288n20, 341
 lyric poet 3, 17, 19n11, 23–5,
 29–31, 33–6, 41, 46, 63, 77, 182,
 206, 246, 248, 270, 297, 297n5,
 298, 298n8, 310n35, 316, 316n49,
 318
Mega Drama 2, 5, 5n23, 248
 Messenia and 97n75, 184–5
 metaphor in 11, 131–2, 202,
 205–40
 metre 98, 140n3, 182, 203, 222n11,
 237n67, 269, 307, 333n8
 mistletoe in 11, 210
 moon in 11, 60, 308–9, 310n35,
 342, 342n53
 Musaeus in 17n4, 342, 342n53
 music and 5, 9, 11, 59, 101, 132,
 157, 179–205, 268, 270–3, 282,
 288
 mythological writings 3, 5, 11–3,
 66–70, 139–54, 171–2, 206–16,
 220–61, 266–81, 284–9
 name 42, 67, 149n51, 269n8
 natural philosopher 46, 297, 306,
 308, 310, 312
 number theory and 11, 296,
 298–300, 302–3, 307–8, 310,
 313–4, 340–1, 341n51, 343
 obituary 2, 2n11, 167, 283
Oeneus (satyr-play) 3n17
Oeneus (tragedy), *see* *Kaineus/Phoenix/Oeneus*
Oeneus
 Oinopion 142–8, 150–1
Omphale, s.v.
 Orpheus and 30–1, 60, 306, 340,
 340n45, 342, 342n53
 paeon-writer 3, 21, 24, 29, 35, 77,
 246, 339n35
paignia in 28, 59n52, 63, 223, 225,
 341n49
 Palamedes and 144, 154, 170n48
 papyri of 247n11, 283, 283n2, 342
 Pericles and 2, 5, 5n26, 7, 20, 24,
 25n23, 46, 68, 82, 89, 89n54,
 99–106, 108, 110–1, 114n13, 115,
 118, 118n25, 119, 123, 127–32,
 138, 175, 184–5, 227, 268n7, 269,
 290

- Pherecydes and 2, 5n26, 10n42,
299–300, 300n13, 300n15, 306,
323n16, 329, 340, 340n46, 343
- Philodemus and 17n4, 59n51,
310n35, 342
- philopotes* 10, 10n45, 31, 72n32, 119,
132, 145n29, 244, 244n5, 269
- philosopher 3, 6, 9, 11, 21–2, 24–5,
29–30, 34, 36, 43, 46, 52, 59–60,
69n27, 72, 77, 114n11, 218, 246,
295–346
- Phoenix/Kaineus/Oeneus* 2–3, 70, 43,
210, 248–9, 333n8
- Phoenix 1* 3, 43, 70, 248–9, 269
- Phoenix 2* 3, 70, 248–9, 272n21
- Phrouroi* 3, 10, 11n46, 70, 207, 210,
248–9, 250–7, 260, 266n1, 272n21
- physiognomics in 117, 156, 220
- Pindar and 21, 78, 257, 309n34,
317, 339n39
- Plato and 5, 20n14, 23n19, 34, 37,
40n44, 42, 77, 115, 316, 318–30,
341
- Plutarch and vii, 2n7, 2n8, 4n18,
5n26, 6, 10n44, 12n51, 17, 23,
35n37, 43n57, 46n4, 52–3, 56n42,
58n48, 58n49, 59, 60n56, 65n7,
66, 75–109, 110n1, 111, 115–9,
120n33, 125, 127–9, 140, 140n3,
145n28, 146–7, 147n35, 147n37,
149n51, 150n52, 154, 167, 167n37,
171n51, 172n54, 172n56, 174–5,
183n15, 184–5, 223, 226, 268n7,
269n9, 307, 309n32, 316, 331n1,
336n20, 338, 341n51, 342n53,
344n72
- politics of 7–9, 12, 66, 106–40, 143,
146–75, 182–5, 198, 202, 205,
218, 220, 223–4, 226, 233–8, 240,
268–9, 281, 290, 329
- polychordia* and 9, 179–205
- polyeideia*/generic versatility 1, 1n3,
3–4, 11, 13, 24, 48, 53–4, 58–9,
64, 77–8, 115, 246, 316n51, 317–8,
327n33
- polymathy 1, 4, 11, 14, 220, 240,
305, 318, 320, 330, 340n46
- Presbeutikos* 3, 3n16, 8n37, 33, 35,
77, 342n54; *see also Epidemiai*
- Prometheus in 5n23
- prose-writer 2–5, 8–9, 13, 17n1,
19n11, 19n12, 21–2, 23n19, 24–5,
29–30, 33–5, 35n37, 36, 41, 43,
53–4, 58–9, 63, 65, 65n4, 77, 80,
80n21, 81, 98–9, 114, 118n24, 139,
140n3, 156, 169, 169n44, 186,
206, 220, 224, 227, 230, 246, 247,
247n17, 298, 299, 300, 300n15,
307, 317
- proverbial wisdom in 43, 59, 249,
249n25, 317, 336n20
- proxenos* 8n37
- pseudepigrapha 2n7, 3, 3n12, 3n17,
47n11, 150n51, 336n24, 341n51
- Pythagoras/Pythagoreans and 9, 21,
30–1, 59, 200, 238n73, 295–318,
323n16, 328–9, 338n32, 340,
340n46, 341n49, 342n54, 343,
343n62, 344
- reception/*Nachleben* 4, 6–7, 12,
17–44, 45–63, 70–2, 75–109, 284,
290–2
- riddles in 202, 210, 212–3, 231–5
- Samos and 6, 77n6, 103, 104n94,
119, 125, 128, 301, 306, 319–330
- satyr-play, *see Omphale*; *see* Ion s.v.
tragedian
- scolion-writer 3, 8n34, 11, 21, 24–5,
29, 35, 77, 145n29, 174n64, 246,
337n29
- Second Sophistic and 49, 75–109
- Seneca and 3n12
- serpent in 11, 139n1
- Socrates and 2, 5, 5n26, 6, 20,
20n14, 22, 24, 34, 36, 77n6, 108,
115, 319–330, 338n32
- son Achilles 10n40, 67n16, 150n51,
165, 165n32, 166
- son Tydeus 10n40, 46, 67, 149–1,
158, 158n7, 159, 165, 165n33,
247n18
- sophia* and 52, 98, 123n44, 173,
238n73, 304n25, 307, 330, 343n62,
344n72
- sophistes* 28, 46, 246, 297, 301,
340n46, 345n72
- sophistry of 28, 297, 301, 340n46,
345n72
- Sophocles and 2–3, 3n17, 5,
5n26, 7, 10, 10n40, 11–3, 17n1,
20–6, 43, 56n42, 66, 68, 77n5,
82, 90n58, 108, 111, 111n2, 114,
116–8, 123–4, 132–3, 172, 172n58,
173–4, 184n20, 206, 213, 215–6,
227, 230, 255–7, 260, 265n74,
266–81, 289, 289n29, 309, 309n34,
321n8, 324, 337n29, 341n51
- Sparta and 8, 11, 24, 46, 49, 67,

- 89n54, 94–7, 101, 120, 138, 149,
158, 167, 174, 174n64, 184–5,
185n21, 221–3, 223n17, 224–5
statistical approach to 53–4
Stesimbrotus and 6, 23n19, 85, 88,
97, 100, 104n95, 106
Street (Chios) 7, 72
Suda on 2n10, 3n12, 3n13, 3n14,
3n16, 5n26, 9n39, 10n41, 18,
18n7, 18n8, 24, 32, 32n34, 33,
36, 38, 39, 45, 45n1, 45n2, 47,
48n15, 50n22, 58n47, 59–60,
60n54, 77, 77n9, 145n29, 149n29,
234, 250, 266n1, 269n8, 271, 283,
288n25, 297, 298n8, 310n35, 312,
312n43, 316, 339n37, 341n51, 342,
345n77
Sunekdemetikos 3, 3n16, 342n54; *see*
also Epidemiai
sunesis 32, 132n69, 202, 297–8, 304,
344n72
symptotica and 8, 10–1, 20, 24–5,
63, 76, 82, 91–2, 108, 124, 126,
147, 153, 158, 172–5, 182–5,
217–40
syrinx in 252, 272n21
Teos and 59, 142–9
Teukros 2, 70, 248
Themistocles and 2, 5, 5n26, 20,
24, 90, 92–4, 117n21, 174, 183–4,
226
Theseus and 12, 65–6, 140–1,
147–9, 154, 171
three in 11, 28, 32, 60, 132n69,
144, 170n48, 269, 278, 286, 296,
298–9, 302–3, 305, 310, 312–4,
341, 342n54, 344
tragedian/satyr-writer 2, 2n7, 2n10,
3, 3n12, 3n17, 4, 4n18, 10–1, 13,
17n1, 19n11, 19n12, 20–4, 24n22,
25, 28–31, 32n34, 33–4, 36–8,
40–1, 43, 43n57, 45–6, 52–4, 56,
58, 63–5, 68, 70–1, 76–9, 100–2,
118, 139, 185n22, 197, 206,
209–11, 216, 230, 243–92, 297,
297n5, 298, 298n8, 301, 309–10,
310n36, 312n43, 316n50, 318,
331n1, 333n8, 339n37, 341,
341n51; *see also Agamemnon, Alcmena,*
Argeioi, Eurytidai, Phoenix/Kaineus,
Oeneus, Laertes, Mega Drama, Omphale,
Phoenix 1, Phoenix 2, Phrouroi, Teukros
Triagmos, s.v.
Trojan plays 21, 70, 248–57, 260
tyche in 9, 11, 32, 52, 98, 132n69,
297–8, 300, 304, 307, 330, 342n54,
344, 344n72
Varro and 17n3
victories 19, 36–7, 69, 104n94,
234, 243–6, 251n31, 261–4, 281,
339n37
vocabulary 7, 10, 10n40, 37, 50,
69n27, 70, 101, 128–32, 170, 216,
237, 248n20, 250, 252, 257–60,
269, 278, 282, 288, 310, 310n35,
311–5, 333n8, 341n51
wealth 19n12, 119, 119n30, 120,
126, 243
wine and 10–1, 20, 23–4, 36–8,
45n1, 68–9, 119, 119n30,
139–154, 172–4, 182n12, 202,
211–3, 217–240, 243–5, 262–4,
271, 278, 285, 287–8, 290, 309n34,
310n35
Ion of Samos 180, 270n14, 336n24
Ion of Ephesus 328, 328n36, 337
Ion and 34, 328
Ionia 1, 7, 50n23, 65, 66n8, 67,
113n9, 129, 142, 148–9, 153–4,
163n23, 166, 171, 240, 247n17,
329n39, 331n1, 341n51
Athens and 30, 38, 42, 66, 103–4,
108–9, 112n5, 117, 128, 138, 142,
143n16, 146, 146n32, 162, 166,
168, 171, 173–4, 225–6
biography and 7, 28n29, 112–3,
243, 295–318, 321, 323, 329n39
dialect 6, 6n28, 7, 70, 78n12, 112,
169–70, 170n48, 336n24
luxury/*truphe* 166, 196, 223, 223n18
music and 180, 186–8, 195, 195n60,
199n73, 204–5
Panionion 65, 171, 173
philosophy in 6, 11, 67n27, 307,
309, 321, 325, 328–30, 341n47,
342n54
Persia and 83, 90, 117, 162,
162n21, 163, 225, 269
revolts 46, 88n53, 117, 128, 146,
146n31, 159n8, 161, 163n23,
225–6, 244n4, 268
Iphitus 283, 283n3, 289
irony 18, 58, 100n81, 197, 225n22,
229, 275, 289, 320, 328, 340,
340n46, 342
islanders 7, 75, 106–8, 128, 138
Isocrates 46, 46n4, 57, 110, 337,
338n30

- Ion in 28–30, 46, 46n3, 59, 60n58,
 297, 305–6, 312n42, 316, 318,
 330n45, 344n72
 Istros 141n8
 Ithome 120, 97n75, 222n9
 Iulus Paulus 62n64

 Jerusalem 319n1
 Johnson, S. 115
 justice (*dike*) 148, 167, 336, 336n20,
 341n47
 Ion and 69, 218, 238–40
 Juvenal 324n21

Kaineus, see *Phoenix*
kairon gnothi 336n20
kairos/*Kairos*/*Hymn to Kairos* 3, 5, 9,
 232, 331–46
 Kaunos 247n17
 Kennedy (airport) 319n3
 kening 202, 210
kithara 181, 181n9, 186–90, 190n39,
 191n45, 192, 198, 204–5; see also lyre
kitharistes 183n16, 187, 193
kitharizein 183
 Knidos 247n17
 Komos 153, 195
 Konnos 193
Kosmologikos 9n39, 35, 298, 298n10,
 312, 315, 342n54; see also *Triagmos*
kratos 32, 132n69, 297–8, 304, 344n72
kruphos 317n54
ktiseis (foundations) 5, 44, 66, 80n21,
 140n3, 146n32, 148, 247n17; see also
 Foundation of Chios (*Chiou Ktisis*)
 as competitive genre 169
Ktisis, see *Foundation of Chios*

 Lacedaimonios 89n54, 125, 269n8
 Lactantius 62
Laertes 2, 70, 209, 248
 Lamachus 150
 Lanzmann, C. 319n1
 Laodicea 63
 Laomedon 90, 269
 Larensis 38
 Leonidas 83–4, 84n35
 Leophron 38
 Lesbos 68, 117, 139n1, 162, 168, 173,
 195n58, 227, 247n17
 Lewis Painter 147–8
 Libanius 63
 libraries 18, 27, 31, 36, 39n42, 42,
 46–7, 55, 62, 312

 Lichas 274–6, 279, 289
 Lindos 142
 Linus 190
 lion 287, 291, 291n35, 317
Little Iliad 249–60
 local historiography, see *ktiseis*
logios 229
 logographers 87, 87n51, 87n52
logos 38n39, 193, 228n30, 229, 299,
 310n35, 314, 332
 Lollianus 42n49
 ‘Longinus’ 3, 12–3, 25, 43n57, 48,
 56n42, 59n49, 61, 72n31, 101n88,
 103n91, 267, 316n48
 Lot 32n34
 Lucas, D. W. 21
 Lucian 32n34, 197n65, 291, 291n35,
 324n21, 336n22
 Lucilius 324n21
 Lucullus 92–4, 94n67, 125n49, 132
 Lupercalia 292
 Lyceum 312
 Lycophron 145n26, 145n27, 145n28
 Lycophron (sophist) 200n77, 343n58
 Lycurgus 47, 55n39
 Lydia 71, 80, 86, 91, 283n4, 284,
 284n5, 285, 291n37, 292
 Ion and 11–2, 91, 197, 210, 272–3,
 275, 277, 279, 282–5, 287–91,
 333n8
 music and 41, 194–5, 195n58,
 196–7, 210, 272–3, 282–3, 288,
 333n8
 lyre/*lyra* 179–205, 331n49, 334n15,
 343n58; see also harp
 Apollo and 183n14, 189–90,
 190n39, 191, 191n45, 203–4,
 204n94
 Aristotle and 186, 192, 192n48,
 195
barbitos 182–3, 185n22, 194–5,
 195n57
 cosmic 200n77, 343n58
dekabamon (ten-stepped) 180–1, 202,
 272
 Eastern 190, 195, 195n58,
 197n67
 hendecachord 5, 9, 180–3, 186n25,
 188, 198, 200, 202–5, 271, 271n18,
 272, 341
 heptachord 181, 181n10, 182,
 183n14, 186–7, 194, 198–9, 202,
 272
 invention of 191, 191n45

- Ion and 5, 9, 90, 157, 180–5, 188,
 198–203, 205, 223, 226, 271–3,
 288n20, 341
kithara 181, 181n9, 186, 186n25,
 187, 187n28, 188–90, 190n39,
 191n45, 192, 198, 204–5
 Lydian harpists 194, 195n58, 196–7,
 272–3, 282–3, 288, 333n8
phorminx 183n14, 272
 tortoise and 181, 190, 201, 201n84
 twelve-stringed 186, 186n27
 Lyre (constellation) 200n77
 lyric 3, 11, 29, 31, 42n50, 44, 55,
 55n36, 63n68, 83, 89, 182, 183n14,
 184, 184n18, 186, 187n29, 188,
 191n45, 193, 193n52, 195n58,
 196n62, 197, 231n40, 334n11,
 334n15, 337n29, 342n54
 Ion and 3, 17, 19n11, 23–4, 24n22,
 25, 29–31, 33–6, 41, 46, 63, 77,
 182, 206, 246, 248, 270, 297,
 297n5, 298, 298n8, 310n35, 316,
 316n49, 318
 Lysander 130–1, 336n24
 Lysias 76n5, 110n1
 Lysippus 344, 344n70
 Lysistrata 95, 95n69, 97n75

magadis 194, 197n64, 272–3, 273n23,
 282, 288, 288n20; *see also* lyre
 Magnes 195n57
 Manganas, S. 71
 Manuel Bryennius 9n38, 59n51, 180,
 272, 341
Marmor Parium 143n16, 146n31
 Maron 244
 Maroneia 244
 marriage 96n72, 107, 107n104, 120,
 153, 341n47
 Marsyas 190
 masks 230–1
 mathematics 78, 301, 306n29, 307,
 343
 measure 223n14, 335–6, 336n20,
 337n29, 339n42, 341
 medicine 29, 54n34, 308, 335,
 335n18, 341n48
Mega Drama 2, 5, 248
 Prometheus in 5n23
 Megara 326n32
 Meineke, A. 39
 Melanippides 186n27
Melanos astu 151
 Melas 65, 146n32, 151

 Meleager 150n56
 Melian dialogue 132–5
 Meliboea 141n8
 Melissus 28, 321n9, 328
 Melos 132–5, 342n54
Memoirs, see Epidemiai
 memory 13, 46, 60–1, 116, 117n19,
 218, 230, 230n37, 238, 264n72,
 307–8, 319n1, 321, 327, 336n24
 Menander 57, 61, 61n60, 63, 63n69,
 333, 333n10, 335n19
 Menander Rhetor 333n8
 Menedemus 322n12
 Menelaus 145n26, 254, 254n36
 Menippean satire 324n21
Meropis 247n17
 Messenia 97n75, 184–5
 metaphor 58n49, 129, 131, 185n23,
 199, 205, 205n98, 206–40
 Ion and 11, 131–2, 202, 205,
 206–40
 riddles as 210, 212–3, 231–5
 wine-related 11, 211–3, 234–5, 238
 metics 136, 261, 271
 metre 44, 55, 98, 140n3, 182, 203,
 218, 222n11, 237n67, 269, 307,
 333n8
metriotes 333n30
 Metrodorus of Chios 71, 257n48
metron 203n90, 336, 336n20
 Milesian scolia 196n60, 199n74
 Miletus 102, 142, 180, 186, 188, 204
 Miltiades 93, 135, 142
 Minoans 147n33
 Minos 148
 Minotaur 213
 Minyas 143n18
 mistletoe 11, 210
 Mnaseas 48n15
moichoi 197
 moon 11, 60, 308–9, 310n35, 342,
 342n53
 Moore, G. E. 323n19
 Moschion 48
mothax 101, 127–31
mothon/Mothon 100–1, 128–9, 129n59,
 185, 185n23
mothonikos 100–1, 127–9, 131, 184–5
 Mount Athos 56
 Mount Pelinnaion 170, 170n48
 Mount Imolus 285, 288, 292
 mountains 67, 191n45, 195n58, 207,
 257–9, 276, 285, 288
 murex 214–5

- Musaeus 17n4, 342, 342n53
 Musaeus (grammaticus) 291n39
 Muses 40, 71, 79n16, 101, 180, 187,
 190, 199, 199n73, 199n75, 204–5,
 218n3, 228
mousike, *see* music
 music and music-making 101, 132,
 157, 179–205, 218, 233, 236n62,
 245n12, 270–4, 285, 297, 311, 343,
 343n64, 343n66
 education 192–3
 harmonic theory 181, 181n10,
 187n28, 200–1, 273, 300–1, 308,
 343, 344n67
 instruments, *see aulos*, *barbitos*, harp,
iambuke, *kithara*, lyre, *magadis*, *pektis*,
phorminx, *psalterion*, *trigonon*
 Ion and 5, 9, 11, 59, 101, 132, 157,
 179–205, 268, 270–3, 282, 288
 Lydia and 41, 194–7, 210, 272–3,
 282–3, 288, 333n8
 modes (Dorian, Mixolydian,
 Phrygian) 187, 187n29, 200, 271
 New Music 5, 9, 186, 186n26, 188,
 192, 197
 Plato on 186, 187n28, 187n29,
 187n30, 190, 192–3, 195, 199, 271
 politics and 9, 179–205
 riddles and 201–2
 Socrates and 193–4
 symposia and 205, 218, 233,
 236n62, 273
 vase-paintings of 189, 190n39, 196,
 204, 204n94
 Mycale, Battle of 163
 Mycenaean 213, 268
 myth 3, 5, 11–3, 19n12, 26, 29–30,
 66–7, 71, 87, 99n80, 139–54, 171–2,
 190, 208, 212, 220, 229–30, 247n17,
 248, 248n19, 266–81, 284–5, 290,
 331n1
 Mytilene 57, 162, 165, 220, 233

 Naucratis 247n17
Naupactia 247n17, 331n1
 navigation 334n13, 335, 335n18,
 344n71, 345n75
 Neleus 143n16, 146
 Nemea 335n16
Nephelekokkygia 159
 Nepos 81
 Nero 343n65
 New Music 5, 9, 186, 186n26, 188,
 192, 197

 Nicander 55n38, 201n84
 Nicias 86, 107n106
 Nicocharas 291
noos 341n47
 number theory 11, 296, 298–303,
 307–8, 310, 313–4, 340–1, 343

occasio 337n26, 344n70
 octopus 43, 249
 Odysseus 114, 145, 145n26, 145n29,
 244
 Ion and 10n42, 249–60
 Oechalia 248n19, 274–80, 283–4,
 289
 Oedipus 23n20
 Oeneis/Oeneidae 152–3
Oeneus 2, 3, 3n17, 43, 70, 210, 248–9,
 333n8, 336
Oeneus 149–54
Oeneus (Attic hero) 151–4
oida 331n1
 Oinopides of Chios 71
 Oinopion
 Chios and 12, 12n51, 65–66, 69,
 140, 142–8, 150–1, 154, 171
 Dionysus and 64, 65n3, 144n23,
 147, 147n35, 147n36, 148, 150
 etymology 69n25, 147
 mythology 142–8, 150–1
 Ion on 142–8, 150–1
 Oeneus and 150–1
 Palamedes and 145n29
 Rhadamanthys and 145n28
 Theseus and 12, 12n51, 65–66, 140,
 147–8, 154, 171
 tomb 147
 vase-painting of 147–8
 Oinotrophoi (Elaia, Oino,
 Spermo) 145, 145n26
olbios 235n55
 Old Oligarch, *see* Pseudo-Xenophon
 Olympia 38, 149n47, 265, 331–46
 Olympic games 38, 78, 338n33,
 339n36
 Olympiodorus 336n20
 Olympus 257, 257n50
 Omphale (Lydian queen) 266–92
 Aspasia as 100, 100n83, 290,
 290n32, 291
 Clearchus and 290n33
 Heracles and 11, 289–92
 madame 100, 291n38
 mime and 291, 291n38, 292
 Tmolus and 284

- Omphale* (Ion's satyr-play)
 Achaëus' *Omphale* 289–90
 Antiphanes' *Omphale* 291
bakkaris in 277, 287, 287n17, 309n34
 Cratinus (Older) *Omphale* 290, 290n32
 Cratinus (Younger) *Omphale* 291, 291n37
 cross-dressing in 12, 278, 287, 290–1
 date 283–4, 289
 Dionysus in 288
Eurytidai and 284, 289
 Heracles 11–2, 197, 248, 269, 274–81, 283–92, 339n39, 341
 Hermes in 275, 283, 285–6, 286n10
 Ionic forms in 286
 Lydia and 282–92
magadis 197n64, 272–3, 273n23, 282, 288, 288n20
mesomphalai 277, 288
 oaks in 276
 Ovid and 292
 Peloponnese in 277, 287
 Pelops 275, 277, 286, 286n10
 Phrygia 286n10
 satyrs in 197, 285, 287–8
 Silenus in 283, 285–8
 Sophocles and 272–81, 289, 309n34
stimmis 278, 287, 287n18
thiasos in 288, 288n25
 Onomacritus 219
 Opportunity, *see kairos*
 Orchomenos 143–4
oregano 70, 270, 287
organon 179, 192
 Origen 32n34
 Orion 142
 Orpheus 9n39, 30, 31, 48n15, 60, 60n54, 306, 312n43, 340, 340n45, 342, 342n52, 342n53, 342n54
 Ion and 30–1, 60, 306, 340, 340n45, 342, 342n53
 Orphic Hymns 333n1, 340n45, 342n54
 Orthomenes 29–30, 37, 67, 149n51, 269n8, 306, 306n28, 313, 342n54, 343
 ostracism 2n7, 26, 89n54
 ostraka 57, 199
 Otherness 8, 11, 220, 235n56
 Oulios 142
 son of Cimon 125, 142, 269n8
ousia 341n47
 Ovid 145n26, 291n36, 292
 oxen 38, 213
 Oxford 19, 19n13, 39, 319n3
Oxford Classical Dictionary 18–27
 Oxford University Press 18n9, 19n12
 Oxyrhynchus 39; *see also* papyri
 Pactolus 275, 278, 287
 paeon 42n50, 78, 238, 337n24, 339n35
 Ion's 3, 21, 24, 29, 35, 77, 246, 339n35
paideia 85, 85n40, 174, 174n63, 184, 192, 254n38
paigion 28, 59n52, 63, 196n62, 223, 225, 228, 341n49
 painting 114, 149n48, 168n43, 215, 227–8, 278, 287, 291n35
 palaestra 336n21
 Palamedes 144–5, 145n26, 145n29, 154
 Palladas 333n10, 344n70
 Palladium 256
 Pamphilus 52
 pamphlets 324n21
pan- compounds 224n19, 237, 237n70
 Panathenaia 136, 189–90, 190n39, 190n41, 192, 198n70, 255, 261, 261n65, 328
 Pandion 152
 panhellenic concepts 10, 95, 97, 105, 138, 149, 158, 172, 198n70, 234n52, 255, 257, 261, 261n64, 262
 panhellenic institutions 9, 172n54, 198n70, 261, 264–5, 336, 338
 Panionion 65, 171, 173
pantodapos 224n19, 229
 Panyassis 80, 247n17, 248n19
 Paphlagonia 234
 papyri 47, 47n10, 56–7, 61–2, 231n39, 239, 342, 342n54
 Callimachus and 27, 39
 Ion and 47n11, 283, 283n2, 342
 Oxyrhynchus 3n12, 3n17, 39, 47n11, 48n15, 57n45, 188n33, 275, 277, 283, 283n2, 286, 291n38, 292
paraprosdokian 237, 286
 Parmenides 28, 304n25, 310n36, 338n32, 342n54
 Parnassus 43n57, 257
 Paros 135
parrhesia 229, 240
 Parthenius 147n35

- Pasiphae 213
 Pausanias (Atticist) 3n14
 Pausanias (periegete) 50n23, 52, 67n14, 78, 141n8, 143, 143n16, 143n17, 143n18, 146n31, 147, 147n33, 149n48, 151n64, 152, 152n66, 187n31, 191n45, 247n17, 331–4, 335n16, 336, 336n23, 337n24, 338n33, 338n34, 339n36, 339n38, 343, 343n65, 345–6, 346n79
 Ion in 3n15, 4n18, 5n21, 12n52, 22, 50, 50n23, 58n47, 65, 65n4, 139, 140n3, 142–4, 146n32, 151n61, 154, 171, 232, 247, 257n48, 331–46
 Pausanias (Spartan) 83–4, 92, 124
 Peisetairos 159
 Peitho 228n30
 Peleus painter 168
 Pelias 259
 Pella 334n70
 Peloponnese 44, 56, 88n53, 91, 91n61, 93n65, 224, 226, 277, 287
 Peloponnesian War 20, 66–7, 84, 86, 86n46, 110, 119n31, 125n50, 138
 Pelops 195n58, 275, 277, 286, 286n10, 287n17
 Penia 199n75
 Pentekontaetia 88n53, 110n1; *see also* Athens
 performance 11, 80n21, 168, 182, 200, 337n29
 Periboea 141n8
Peri Chiou, *see* *Foundation of Chios*
 Pericleidas 94, 97n75
 Pericles 83–5, 85n39, 86, 93, 93n65, 97n77, 99–106, 110, 116–7, 119n31, 122, 125n50, 126–7, 132, 135–7, 224, 290, 309n33
 Agamemnon and 103–4, 128
 Chrysilla and 31, 174, 269
 citizenship law 136–7, 171
 comic poets and 84n37, 100–1, 102n90, 105, 290
 funeral speech 100n84, 103, 104n93
 Ion and 2, 5, 5n26, 7, 20, 24, 25n23, 46, 68, 82, 89, 89n54, 99–106, 108, 110–1, 114n13, 115, 118–119, 123, 127–32, 138, 175, 184–5, 227, 268n7, 269, 290
mothomikos 100–1, 101n87, 127–31, 185, 185n23
 Odeion and 190, 190n40
 Olympian manner 100, 105, 118
 Perseidai 222
 Persia 83, 86, 96n73, 97, 162, 162n21, 163, 225, 309
 Persian Wars 20, 84, 84n35, 90, 93n66, 94, 110, 110n1, 112, 117, 149n48, 162, 190n40, 226, 269
 Persius 324n21
 personification 9, 186, 199n73, 199n75, 232–3, 331–46
 persuasion 228
 Pfeiffer, R. C. F. O. 39
 Phaedra 148, 239n77
 Phaedrus 337n24
 Phaedrus (fabulist) 344n70
 Phanai 290
 Phanios 344n70
pharmakon 217, 235, 236n64, 237–8
 Phaselis decree 163–4
Pheme 345n75
 Phereboea 141n8
 Pherecrates 186, 186n27, 199n73
 Pherecydes of Athens 141–2, 143, 143n16, 143n18, 143n20, 144, 145n27, 146n31, 146n32, 283n3
 Pherecydes (Pythagorean) 2, 5n26, 10n42, 299–300, 300n13, 300n15, 306, 323n16, 329, 340, 340n46, 343
 Philaidae 142, 345n75
 Philemon 48n15
 Philip 165, 165n32, 166
 Philo 211n17
 Philochorus 97n75
 Philocleon 115n15
 Philodemus 17n4, 59n51, 310n35, 342
 Philolaus 301, 302, 302n19, 303n22, 309
 Philoponus 28, 58n48, 60, 60n57, 61, 304–5, 310, 310n36, 316
philopotes 10, 10n45, 31, 72n32, 119, 132, 145n29, 244, 244n5, 269
 philosophy 6, 20, 29–30, 42n49, 48n13, 78, 102–3, 110, 121, 126–7, 193–4, 239, 316, 319–30, 333n8, 342n54; *see also* Archelaus; Aristotle; Diogenes Laertius; Plato; Pythagoras; Pythagoreanism; Socrates; *Triagmos*
 Ion and 3, 6, 9, 11, 21–2, 24–5, 29–30, 34, 36, 43, 46, 52, 59–60, 69n27, 72, 77, 114n11, 218, 246, 295–346
 Presocratic 43, 69n27, 299–300, 300n13, 300n15, 305, 317, 317n54,

- 317n56, 318, 321, 323n15, 325–6,
329n40, 338n32, 338n33, 342n54
symposia and 192–4, 227n29, 228,
228n29
- Philostratus 78
- Phocaea 334n13
- Phocylides 96n72
- Phoenix/Kaineus/Oeneus* 2–3, 43, 70,
210, 248–9, 333n8
- Phoenix 1* 3, 43, 70, 248–9, 269
- Phoenix 2* 3, 70, 248–9, 272n21
- Phokais* 247n17
- phorminx* 183n14, 272
- Phoronis* 247n17
- Photius 3n14, 5n23, 5n26, 11n46,
32n34, 49, 50n22, 63, 118n24,
207n5, 252, 257, 269–70, 276,
288n25, 304n24, 333n8, 334n15
- Phrixos 143
- Phrouroi* 3, 10, 11n46, 70, 207, 210,
248–57, 260, 266n1, 272n21
- Phrygia 91, 187n29, 194, 195n58,
268, 271, 272n21, 286n10
- Phrynichus 10, 56, 63, 199n73
- Phrynichus (grammarian) 58n47
- Phrynīs 188n31, 192, 192n47
- Phthia 143n18
- phthongos* 180
- Phylarchus 101n85, 130n62
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 19, 26
- Pignes of Halicarnassus 324n21
- Pindar 63n68, 64, 64n1, 78, 79n16,
107, 107n104, 121–2, 122n40,
181n10, 183n14, 195, 202, 202n88,
205n98, 208n7, 223n14, 235n61,
249n25, 257n50, 273, 274n27,
317n54, 333n7, 333n8, 334n15,
335n17, 336n20, 339, 339n35,
339n36, 339n41, 340, 340n44, 341,
341n48
- Ion and 3, 21, 43n57, 78, 257, 267,
309n34, 317, 339, 339n39
- Pisander 248n19
- Pittacus 220, 233, 336n20
- Plataea 168, 333n8
- Plato 38, 40n44, 41–2, 46n5, 47, 51,
51n25, 55, 59n49, 60n58, 76n5,
78–9, 79n14, 79n16, 79n18, 83n31,
94n67, 98–9, 99n81, 101n88, 105,
107, 110, 110n1, 126, 132n68,
140n3, 187, 187n28, 187n29, 192–3,
193n52, 196n60, 199, 201n80,
209, 209n13, 211, 211n17, 219,
222n13, 227n29, 229, 235n59,
236n64, 239n80, 246n16, 290n32,
297, 301n17, 312–3, 319n3, 320n4,
325n26, 327–8, 336n20, 337, 337n24,
338n32, 338n35, 339n42, 344n71
dialogue form 5, 23n19, 77, 115,
318
- Ion* (dialogue) 34, 37, 42, 78n12, 79,
79n16, 79n18, 229, 327–8
- Ion of Chios and 5, 20n14, 23n19,
34, 37, 40n44, 42, 77, 115, 316,
318–30, 341
- music and 186, 187n28, 187n29,
187n30, 190, 192–3, 195, 199,
271
- Pythagoreanism in 301
- symposia and 192–3, 219, 222,
236n64, 243, 320n5
- Plato Comicus 195n60
- Pleistoanax 83, 135
- Pliny the Elder 51, 147n35, 275,
343n65
- Pliny the Younger 51n25
- Plutarch 2n7, 10n45, 32n35, 42n49,
46n6, 47n7, 48n13, 51, 51n25, 52,
55n39, 62n64, 71, 75–109, 110n1,
117n22, 125, 125n49, 127n55, 128,
131, 131n67, 132, 135, 138, 141n7,
141n8, 146, 153, 164, 175n65,
184n17, 186–7, 187n30, 187n31,
188n33, 190, 201, 201n83, 205n97,
219, 227n29, 230, 231n39, 231n41,
244n62, 63n69, 290n32, 291n35, 316,
337, 343–4
- Ion in vii, 2n7, 2n8, 4n18, 5n26,
6, 10n44, 12n51, 17, 23, 35n37,
43n57, 46n4, 52–3, 56n42, 58n48,
58n49, 59, 60n56, 65n7, 66,
75–109, 110n1, 111, 115–9,
120n33, 125, 127–9, 140, 140n3,
145n28, 146–7, 147n35, 147n37,
149n51, 150n52, 154, 167, 167n37,
171n51, 172n54, 172n56, 174–5,
183n15, 184–5, 223, 226, 268n7,
269n9, 307, 309n32, 316, 331n1,
336n20, 338, 341n51, 342n53,
344n72
- Pseudo-Plutarch 309n32
- Plutarch (son of Nestorius) 42n49
- Pollux 3n16, 22, 48n15, 185n23,
205n97, 248n22, 277–8, 282, 286–7,
287n18, 288n22, 291n37, 342,
342n54
- polychordia* 9, 179–205
- Polybius 87n51

- Polyclitus 334, 335n16, 336n22, 343, 343n65, 343n66, 344, 344n70, 345
 Polycrates of Samos 107, 115
polyeideia 13, 17–44, 54–61, 78–9, 261
 Agathon 79n17
 Callimachus 17–44, 48, 58n49, 78, 316n51
 Critias 79, 246n13
 Hippias 78–9
 Ion 1, 1n3, 3, 4, 11, 13, 24, 48, 53–4, 58–9, 64, 77, 78, 115, 246, 316n51, 317, 318, 327n33
 Plato on 55, 79, 79n16, 79n17, 79n18
 Prodicus 78–9
 Sophocles 42n52
 Xenophon 79
polymathia 1, 4, 11, 14, 31, 58n49, 220, 240, 305, 318, 320, 327, 330, 340n46
 Polyphemus 244
 Pompeios 345n75
 Pompey 93
poneros 235, 235n55
ponos 235n55, 235n57
 Porphyry 313
 portraiture 18, 113, 113n9, 113n10, 114
 Poseidon 65, 71, 171, 257, 334, 340n47
 Asphaleios 345n75
 Posidippus 344n70
praotes 93, 99
prepon 336n20, 338n30
Presbeutikos 3, 3n16, 8n37, 33, 35, 77, 342n54; *see also* *Epidemiai*
 Hippocratic 267n3
 Procles 8, 221, 222, 222n11
 Proclus 249, 250, 250n27, 253, 253n34, 256, 334n15
 Prodicus 78–9, 79n14, 339n42
 Prometheus 5n23, 280n35
 Propertius 291n36
prophasis 229
 prose-writing 5, 29, 42n52, 44, 57, 59, 62, 65n4, 75, 78, 79, 80, 80n20, 80n21, 81, 87, 87n51, 98, 99, 102–103, 112, 113, 140, 140n3, 141, 169, 169n44, 198, 198n68, 219, 220, 224, 230, 235n59, 239, 247n17, 298, 299, 300, 300n15, 317, 320n5
 Ion's 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 17n1, 19n11, 19n12, 21, 22, 23n19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 35n37, 36, 41, 43, 53, 54, 58, 59, 63, 65, 65n4, 77, 80, 80n21, 81, 98, 99, 114, 118n24, 139, 140n3, 156, 169, 169n44, 186, 206, 220, 224, 227, 230, 246, 247, 247n17, 298, 299, 300, 300n15, 307, 317
prosopon 230
prosopopoeia 232, 334n11
 Protagoras 314, 339n42
prytaneion 94n67
prytanis 152, 218, 221, 237
pseudes 228n30
 Pseudo-Longinus 3, 12–3, 25, 43n57, 48, 56n42, 59n49, 61, 72n31, 101n88, 103n91, 267, 316n48
 Pseudo-Phocylides 96n72
 Pseudo-Xenophon 77n5, 110n1, 123, 129, 164n25, 185n23, 228n33, 235n55
 purple 91, 94, 213–5, 291
 Pythagoras 23, 32n34, 238n73, 295–318, 322n14, 323n15, 326n27, 326n32, 328, 343n66
 Diogenes Laertius on 5n26, 10n42, 59n51, 60, 200, 301, 305–6, 322n14, 325n16, 326n27, 326n32, 328–9, 340
 Ion and 9, 21, 30, 31, 59, 200, 238n73, 295–318, 323n16, 328, 329, 338n32, 340, 340n46, 341n49, 342n54, 343, 343n62, 344; *see also* *Triagmos*
 Orphic writings and 30, 31, 60, 306, 340, 340n45
 Pythagorean(ism) 9, 21, 30, 209, 295–318, 340, 342n54, 343, 344n72
 akousmata 307
 Aristotle on 301, 302, 302n21, 303, 306, 313, 340, 341n47
 ethics 9, 300, 302, 305, 306, 307, 308
 harmony 300, 341n49, 343, 343n66
 music 59, 200, 200n77, 343n66
 number theory 296, 298, 301, 302, 303, 307, 310, 311, 313, 314, 340, 341n47, 341n51, 343
 Parmenides and 304n25, 338n32, 342n54
 silence 343, 343n61
 Quintilian 55, 55n39, 57, 58n46, 103n91
 Remembrances (*Mneiai*) 218n3
 Rhadamanthys 145n28
 rhapsodes 328, 334n15, 338n33

- Rhegas, Ph. 71
 rhetoric 145n29, 184n18, 193,
 193n52, 194, 205n97, 218, 233n46,
 239n80, 297, 298n7, 337, 339n42
 Rhodes 247n17
rhythmos 195n58, 343n64
 riddles (*ainigmai*, *griphoi*) 201–2, 210,
 212–3, 231–5, 307, 337n29
 Aesop's 201
 Aristotle on 231–2, 231n39
 Cleobulina's 201
 metaphor and 210, 212–3, 231–5
 music-related 201–2
 Pythagorean 307
 sympotic 201–2, 231–5
 Russell, B. 323n19
 Russian Formalists 208n11
- Salagos 65
Salamina 128
 Salamis 141, 141n7, 190n40, 204
 Sallustius 12n50
 Samos 6, 9, 90, 102, 107, 117,
 146n31, 151, 153, 173, 247n17, 274
 Archelaus and 6, 77n6, 319–330
 Athens and 46, 68, 90, 100n84,
 102–3, 103n91, 117, 125, 146n31,
 160n13, 168, 173n59, 179, 326–7,
 328
 Chios and 68, 117, 151, 173, 269,
 274, 306, 320
 Ion and 6, 77n6, 103, 104n94, 119,
 125, 128, 301, 306, 319–330
 Pericles and 46, 68, 102–3, 104n94,
 119, 128
 philosophy and 9, 301, 306–7,
 319–330
 revolt 23, 46, 68, 102, 117, 119,
 128, 173n59
 Socrates and 6, 77n6, 319–330
 Sophocles and 23, 68, 173, 173n61
 Sappho 42n50, 83, 183n14, 194,
 331n1
 Sardis 107, 277, 287, 326n32
 Sarpedon 122, 122n42
 satyr-play 44, 102n90, 282, 285–6,
 288–92, 292n40
 Ion and 3, 3n17, 11, 20–1, 24, 31,
 45, 79, 100, 102, 118, 197, 248,
 266–92, 341; *see also Omphale*
 Satyrus 188n33, 263n69
 Satyrus (historian) 147n35, 151n58
Sayings of the Spartans 51
 Schneider, O. 39
- Scipios 98
 Scylla 278n33, 342n52
 Scymnus 71
 Scyros 90
 Scythinus 200n77, 343n58
 Second Sophistic 13, 49, 75, 346n79
 Selinus 113n10, 195n58
 Semonides of Amorgos 195n57
 Seneca 3n12, 291n36
sententiae 49, 54, 238, 336n20
 serio-comic 42, 324n21
 serpent 11, 139n1
 Servius 145n26, 151n60, 256n45
 Sestos 90, 90n57, 117, 117n19, 174,
 226
 seven 340, 341n47, 342n53; *see also*
 lyre; number theory
 Seven Sages 5, 51, 201, 297
 sex 10, 65, 68, 82, 100, 111, 118,
 118n23, 120, 153, 166, 166n35, 173,
 196–7, 206, 219, 222, 227, 227n27,
 269, 288, 290n33, 291, 326n32, 327
 Sextus Empiricus 60n58
 shamanism 302
 Sicilian expedition 161, 225
 Sicily 56, 76n5, 244n7, 263
 Sicyon 344n70
 Sidonius Apollinaris 63n65
 Simonides of Ceos 5, 38, 42n50, 78,
 79n16, 145n26, 197, 228n34, 246n16,
 270n16, 333n8
 Simos 153
 Simplicius 300, 300n14, 302n21,
 303–4, 304n25, 311n37
simulacra 227, 256n45
 Sinope 10, 31, 48, 72n32, 119n27,
 145n29, 244n5, 316, 316n53
 scolia 3, 11, 21, 24–5, 29, 35, 77,
 145n29, 196n60, 199n74, 246,
 337n29
 Skythiades 3
 Smith, P. 19n12
 Smith, Sir W. 19n12
 Socrates 22, 42, 76–7, 79n17, 79n18,
 99n81, 193, 193n52, 229, 233n45,
 319–330, 337n24, 338n32
 Archelaus and 5n26, 6, 20n14,
 319–330
 Athens and 6, 22, 108, 319–330
 Ion and 2, 5, 5n26, 6, 20, 20n14,
 22, 24, 34, 36, 77n6, 108, 115,
 319–330, 338n32
 Melissus and 321n9, 328
 Samos and 6, 77n6, 319–330

- Solon 42n52, 56, 83, 126, 146n31, 341n47
sophia 52, 98, 123n44, 173, 238n73, 304n25, 307, 330, 343n62, 344n72
 sophists 28, 76n5, 94n67, 107, 126, 134, 194, 200n77, 226, 228, 228n30, 239, 239n78, 255n42, 297, 301, 336, 338n30, 338n33, 339, 340n46, 341, 342n54, 345n72
 Ion as *sophistes* 28, 46, 297, 301, 340n46, 345n72
 Sophocles 3, 3n17, 12, 12n50, 13, 23, 42n52, 46, 46n6, 47, 47n11, 55–6, 56n39, 56n42, 64, 64n1, 68, 78–9, 122n41, 124, 133, 135, 151n58, 173n61, 201n84, 204, 211n17, 213–5, 255–6, 256n44, 256n45, 257, 257n50, 260–1, 266–81, 286n12, 288n20, 289, 289n27, 309, 334n15, 337n29
dexios 184n20, 227, 227n25
homerikotatos 70, 341n51
 Ion and 2–3, 3n17, 5, 5n26, 7, 10, 10n40, 11–3, 17n1, 20–6, 43, 56n42, 66, 68, 77n5, 82, 90n58, 108, 111, 111n2, 114, 116–8, 123–4, 132–3, 172, 172n58, 173–4, 184n20, 206, 213, 215–6, 227, 230, 255–7, 260, 265n74, 266–81, 289, 289n29, 309, 309n34, 321n8, 324, 337n29, 341n51
 Sophocles the younger 48
 Sophron 324n21
 Sosiades 51
 Sosicrates 322n14
 Sotades 42
 soul 91, 92n61, 209, 209n13, 301n17, 302, 341n47
 South Italy 9, 247n17, 301, 306n28, 328, 334, 338n32, 340, 345
 Sparta 38, 51, 67, 83, 83n31, 84, 84n35, 86, 93n65, 93n66, 107n106, 125, 128–31, 133–5, 161–2, 164
agoge 129–30
 Archidamus of 24, 49, 89n54, 120, 174, 174n64, 221–2
 euergetism 121n39
 Eurypontids 222
 Ion and 8, 11, 24, 46, 49, 67, 89n54, 94–7, 101, 120, 138, 149, 158, 167, 174, 174n64, 184–5, 185n21, 221–3, 223n17, 224–5
mothax 100–1, 127–31, 184–5, 185n23
 music at 187–8, 199n73, 204n96, 205, 205n97
nothoi 130
susstitia 121n39, 131, 222
 Spartan War Fund 164
spoudogeloion 42, 70, 324n21
 Staphylos 145, 145n28, 147, 147n35, 148, 151
 Stephanus of Byzantium 143n16
 Stesichorus 193, 193n52, 197, 255, 338n32
 Stesimbrotus of Thasos 85n39, 87n51, 88–9, 89n54, 89n56, 91, 91n59, 91n61, 93n65, 94, 97, 97n77, 100, 100n84, 104n95, 106, 110n1
 Ion and 6, 23n19, 85, 88, 97, 100, 104n95, 106
 Stilpo 326n32
 Stobaeus 51–4, 60n56, 60n58, 337n29
 Ion in 2n8, 3n12, 60, 60n55, 60n56, 61, 309n32, 338
 Strabo 52, 107n102, 140n3, 143n16, 146n31, 146n32, 148
 Ion in 43n57, 48, 52, 275, 282, 286n10
 Strachey, L. 81, 81n23
stasis 223n14
 Stratoniceus 201n80
 Strattis 162–3
 Suda 32n34, 38, 38n38, 38n40, 38n41, 42n49, 42n50, 42n51, 42n52, 44, 55n38, 298n10, 312
 dithyramb in 3n13, 3n16, 18, 18n7, 32–3, 39, 342, 345n77
 Ion in 2n10, 3n12, 3n13, 3n14, 3n16, 5n26, 9n39, 10n41, 18, 18n7, 18n8, 24, 32, 32n34, 33, 36, 38–9, 45, 45n1, 45n2, 47, 48n15, 50n22, 58n47, 59–60, 60n54, 77, 77n9, 145n29, 149n29, 234, 250, 266n1, 269n8, 271, 283, 288n25, 297, 298n8, 310n35, 312, 312n43, 316, 339n37, 341n51, 342, 345n77
 Sulla 46
Sunekdemetikos 3, 3n16, 342n54; *see also* *Epidemiai*
sunesis 32, 132n69, 202, 297–8, 304, 344n72
susstitia 121n39, 131, 222
 Syleus 285–6, 287n14, 289
 Syleus Painter 148n39
symmetria 341, 341n48
 symposium 9, 11, 63, 85n39, 120, 179–205, 217–40, 324n21

- Apollo and 238
 competition at 172, 191, 231,
 263n68, 273
dike at 217, 239–40
 Dionysus and 211–2, 217–8, 221,
 224, 230, 236n62, 237–8, 288–90,
 304
 eyes at 235–6, 236n62
 games and riddles at 153, 201–2,
 231–5, 240, 337, 340
 Heracles at 286–9, 277–8
 hymns and 225n22, 238, 333n8,
 334n15, 337n29
 Ion and 8, 10–1, 20, 24–5, 63, 76,
 82, 91–2, 108, 124, 126, 147, 153,
 158, 172–5, 182–5, 217–40
 libations at 90, 218, 221, 222n13,
 239, 278, 287
 memory and 218, 230
 metasympotic 182, 202, 222, 225,
 227, 233, 236
 moderation and 223n14, 239,
 337n29
 music and 179–205, 218, 233,
 236n62, 273
Omphale and 277–8, 286–9
 paedagogy at 174n63, 183n16, 184,
 192–3, 227, 227n29, 231n39
penia and 199n75
 philosophy at 192–4, 227n29, 228
 Plato and 192–3, 219, 222, 236n64,
 243, 320n5
 prose and 219–20, 320n5
prytanis of 218, 221
 rules and conventions of 218, 220,
 220n5, 225n21, 226, 231, 239–40
 sex and 68, 82, 111, 118, 118n23,
 120, 173, 196–7, 206, 219, 222,
 227, 227n7, 288
 silence at 232–3, 233n45
 Spartan 221–2, 223n17, 225
syn- and 224, 224n20
 truth and 174, 226–31
 unity and 236–7
 victory-parties 243, 243n4
 wine at, s.v.
 Syrianus 42n49
syrix 187, 252, 272n21

Tabula Montefalconii 56n40
 Tacitus 82
 Talos 65
 Telamon 142
 Teleclides 197

Telegonia 247n17
Telegonus 255n41
 Telestes of Selinus 195n58
 Tellias of Acragas 38
 Teos 59, 107, 142–4, 146n32, 151,
 154
 Terpander 183n14, 187n31, 195, 272
 tetrachord, *see* lyre
tetractys 308, 311
 Thales 298n10, 309, 325, 338n33
 Thamyrras 190, 204, 204n94, 273–4,
 288
 Theatre of Dionysus 152, 190, 204
theatrokratia 186, 189–94
 Thebes 64, 143n18, 150, 152, 244,
 248
theios aner 83n31
 Themistocles 42n52, 83, 83n31, 84,
 84n35, 85, 85n39, 86, 88, 89n54,
 113n10, 135, 184n17
 Ion and 2, 5, 5n26, 20, 24, 90,
 92–4, 117n21, 174, 183–4, 226
 Odeion and 184n18, 190n40
 Plutarch and 89n54, 90–4, 99
 Theocritus 195n57, 246n16
 Theocritus of Chios 71
 Theodectes 48
 Theognidea 108, 182n12, 199n75,
 202, 202n85, 202n87, 202n88, 219,
 223n14, 227n27, 227n29, 228n32,
 238, 239n80, 334n15, 344n70
 Theophrastus 46, 304n24, 304n25,
 313
 Theopompus of Chios 64n3, 71–2,
 94n67, 146n32, 147n36, 148, 150n57,
 160–1
 Theron of Acragas 317n54
thesaurus 205, 205n98
 Theseus 43, 141n8, 149n47, 289n27
 Athens and 66, 141, 141n6, 142,
 148–9, 149n48
 Chios and 12, 12n51, 65–6, 66n9,
 141, 147–9, 171
 Cimon and 12, 66, 66n10, 90,
 141–2, 345n75
 Ion on 12, 65–6, 140–1, 147–9,
 154, 171
 vase-paintings of 141, 147–8
 Thespis 56
Thesprotis 247n17
 Thessalos 125, 269n8
 Thessalos (Hippocrates' son) 267n3
 Thessaly 143n18, 143n19, 148
 Thoreau, H. D. 319

- Thrasyrnachos 160
 three 11, 28, 32, 60, 132n69, 144,
 170n48, 269, 278, 286, 296, 298–9,
 302–3, 305, 310, 312–4, 341, 342n54,
 344; *see also* number theory
 Thucydides 10, 49, 57, 67, 67n18, 71,
 81, 81n22, 83n31, 84, 84n36, 84n37,
 85–6, 86n46, 87, 87n51, 87n52, 88,
 93n65, 97n75, 98n78, 99n81, 100,
 102–3, 103n91, 104, 107, 107n106,
 110n1, 112n5, 114n10, 117, 117n22,
 118n26, 119, 119n28, 119n31, 132–4,
 134n71, 135, 135n73, 138, 146n41,
 149n48, 161–2, 162n17, 164n25, 165,
 165n30, 168, 168n6, 169, 173n59,
 198n68, 224–6, 228–9, 239n77,
 246n16, 268, 268n6, 312n39
 Ion and 10n40, 46, 67n16, 71,
 87n51, 88, 88n53, 103–4, 127,
 140, 149, 149n50, 149n51, 158–9,
 244n4
 Thucydides (son of Melesias) 83,
 89n54
 Tiberius 298n6
 Timaeus 229, 301
 time, *see chronos/Chronos*
time 191
 Timocles 79n17
 Timon 298n6, 326n32
 Timotheus 180, 186, 186n25, 187,
 187n31, 188, 188n33, 199n73, 204,
 204n96, 205, 205n97, 205n98
 Titans 19n13, 223
 Tomyrus 229
tonos 180, 271–2
 tourism 170
 tragedy/satyr-play 2, 2n7, 2n10, 3,
 3n12, 3n13, 3n17, 4, 4n18, 10–1, 13,
 17n1, 19n11, 19n12, 20–4, 24n22,
 25–6, 28–31, 32n34, 33–4, 36–8,
 40–1, 42n50, 43, 43n57, 44–5, 45n1,
 46, 48, 52–4, 54n33, 54n34, 55,
 55n39, 56, 58, 63–6, 68, 70–1, 75–9,
 79n17, 79n18, 81, 100–2, 102n89,
 102n90, 103, 105, 118, 124, 139,
 184n20, 185, 185n22, 185n23, 196,
 196n60, 197, 199, 206, 209–11,
 216, 227n29, 228, 230, 234–92, 297,
 297n5, 298, 298n8, 301, 309–10,
 310n36, 312n43, 316n50, 318, 331n1,
 333n8, 334n15, 338n33, 339n37, 341,
 341n51
 transmigration 302, 317n54, 340n46
Triagmos 3, 9, 19n11, 21, 24, 24n22,
 30, 30n31, 31n32, 35–6, 52, 59, 61,
 77, 295–318, 323n16, 323n19,
 329–30, 341n51, 344
arete in 98, 100, 128, 299, 305, 310,
 330
 as philosophy 295–318
 Athens and 330
 cosmology and 9, 21, 28, 30–1, 78,
 295–318, 330
 date 330
 Diogenes of Apollonia and 298n10,
 299–300, 304, 309
 early prose works and 299–300,
 300n15
 elements in 28, 60, 297, 304–5, 310,
 310n36, 330
 ethics in 305–8, 314
Kosmologikos 9n39, 35, 298, 298n10,
 312, 315, 342n54
kratos 32, 132n69, 297–8, 304,
 344n72
 moon in 60, 308–9, 342n53
 number theory in 11, 296, 298–300,
 302–3, 307–8, 310, 313–4, 340–1,
 341n51, 343
 Orpheus in 30–1, 60, 306, 340,
 340n45, 342, 342n53
paignton 28, 59n52, 63, 223, 341n49
Peri meteoron 9n39, 33, 37, 298,
 298n10, 312
Physics? 305
 Pythagoreanism and 9, 295–318,
 341n49, 342n54
sunesis 32, 132n69, 202, 297–8, 304,
 344n72
 three in 28, 32, 60, 132, 296,
 298–9, 302–3, 305, 310–5, 342n54,
 344
 title/s 9, 9n39, 28, 31, 296–7,
 311–5, 342n54
Triagmoi 9n39, 31, 297, 311–5,
 329–30
Triasmoi 313
 triangles 28, 30–1, 301, 301n17, 311
 tripods 65, 263, 313, 315
 Trojan War/Troy 21, 46, 70, 84, 103,
 128, 144–5, 154, 244, 248–56, 260
 truth 87, 88n52, 91, 91n61, 99, 102–3,
 299n11
 falsehood and 228, 228n30
 prose and 87, 99, 102–3, 230
 symposia and 174, 226–31
 Trygaeus 167, 266–7
 Tryphon 273

- Turks 49
tyche/Tyche 52–3, 72, 98–9, 342n54, 344, 344n71
 Ion and 9, 11, 32, 52, 98, 132n69, 297–8, 300, 304, 307, 330, 342n54, 344, 344n72
 Pythagorean 304, 344, 344n72
 Tydeus (Ion's son) 10n40, 46, 67, 149–51, 158, 158n7, 159, 165, 165n33, 247n18
 Tydeus (Lamachus' son) 150
 Tydeus (mythological) 150, 150n54
 Tzetzes 56, 56n40, 278, 286, 342
- Varro 17n3, 324n21
- vases and vase-painting 11, 52, 113n10, 141, 141n9, 147–8, 148n38, 148n39, 150n57, 152–3, 153n71, 168n41, 170n48, 179, 189n38, 190n39, 203–4, 219, 244n7, 245n9, 256n44, 259, 260n61, 270, 270n13, 278, 287, 287n15, 310n35
 Anacreontic 194
 Andocides Painter 189n39
 Brygos Painter 189n39
 Dinos Painter 152–3
 Euthymides 113n10
 Exekias 147n36, 150n57
 eyes on 236, 236n62
 Lewis Painter 147–8
 Meidias Painter 204
 music themes on 189, 190n39, 196, 204, 204n94
 Oeneus on 152–3
 Omphale on 287, 287n15
 Peleus Painter 168
 Syleus Painter 148n39
 Velia (Elea) 247n17, 334, 334n13, 334n18, 338n32, 340n47, 342n54
 Vergil 17n4, 257n51
 victories 38, 65, 78, 90, 104n94, 122, 122n41, 126, 126n51, 147, 153, 190n40, 192, 192n47, 204, 227, 243n3, 243n4, 264n72, 328, 339, 339n41, 345; *see also agones*
 vine, *see* grapes
 Vitruvius 184n18, 190n40
- Wells, H. G. 323n19
Weltanschauung 155
 Westmacott Ephebe 343n65
 wine 174, 193, 195n58, 219, 227, 227n29, 233, 236
 bull-faced 11, 211–3
- Chian wine 20, 24, 36–8, 64n3, 69, 69n25, 145, 145n29, 172, 233–4, 238, 244–5, 262–4, 271, 335n17
 cups 11, 52, 170, 219, 225, 236, 236n62, 259–60, 277–8, 287–8, 288n22, 310n35
 Dionysus and 69, 145, 147, 147n36, 150–1, 153, 212, 217, 221, 238, 288
 inspectors 236
 Ion and 10–1, 20, 23–4, 36–8, 45n1, 68–9, 119, 119n30, 139–154, 172–4, 182n12, 202, 211–3, 217–40, 243–5, 262–4, 271, 278, 285, 287–8, 290, 309n34, 310n35
 Lydia and 285, 288
 metaphors of 11, 211–3, 234–5, 238
 mixing 11n45, 50, 69n25, 144, 170n48, 195n58, 221, 223n14
 myths 69, 144–5, 150–1, 153
 Oinopion and 69, 69n25, 142–8, 150–1
 pourers/attendants 68, 118, 118n23, 151, 172, 221, 227, 335n17
 symposia and 217–240
 trade 233n48
 truth and 174, 227, 227n29, 238
 “wine-face” 69n25, 147, 213
 Wooden Horse 254
 writing-tablets 57
- Xanthus of Lydia 80
xenia 107, 107n104, 124, 172, 175
 Xenocrates 307n30
 Xenophanes 80, 219–20, 220n5, 222–3, 223n14, 239, 247n17, 318, 337n29
 Xenophon 5, 46n5, 58n49, 68n21, 76, 76n5, 77, 79, 79n14, 82, 85, 95n68, 97n75, 107, 115, 121n39, 130–1, 141n4, 219, 225n21, 233n45, 323, 323n19, 324; *see also* Pseudo-Xenophon
 Xuthus (father of Ion) 29–30, 37, 67, 149n51, 269n8, 306, 306n28, 313, 342n54, 343
 Xuthus (mythical) 30, 67, 149n51, 150n51
 Xuthus/Buthus (Pythagorean) 306, 306n28, 342n54, 343
- Yale University 319n3
 Ypocras 267n3

- Zanes 332, 336, 336n23
Zenis of Chios 148, 148n42
Zeno 100–2
Zenobius 3n14
Zenobius Athous 3n14, 48n15
Zeus 19, 191, 221–2, 222n12, 267,
279, 314, 331, 332n6, 334, 335n16,
336, 336n23
Ourios 345n75
Zoilus 255n43
Zolatas, G. 65
Zonaras 288n25

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,
I.J.F. DE JONG AND P.H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

270. NAUTA, R.R., H.-J. VAN DAM & H. SMOLENAARS (eds.). *Flavian Poetry*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14794 2
271. TACOMA, L.E. *Fragile Hierarchies*. The Urban Elites of Third-Century Roman Egypt. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14831 0
272. BLOK, J.H. & A.P.M.H. LARDINOIS (eds.). *Solon of Athens*. New Historical and Philological Approaches. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-14954-0, ISBN-10: 90-04-14954-6
273. HORSEFALL, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 3. A Commentary*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14828 0
274. PRAUSCELLO, L. *Singing Alexandria*. Music between Practice and Textual Transmission. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14985 6
275. SLOOTJES, D. *The Governor and his Subjects in the Later Roman Empire*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15070-6, ISBN-10: 90-04-15070-6
276. PASCO-PRANGER, M. *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15130-7, ISBN-10: 90-04-15130-3
277. PERRY, J.S. *The Roman Collegia*. The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15080-5, ISBN-10: 90-04-15080-3
278. MORENO SOLDEVILA, R. *Martial, Book IV* A Commentary. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15192-5, ISBN-10: 90-04-15192-3
279. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUTTER (eds.). *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15043-0, ISBN-10: 90-04-15043-9
280. COOPER, C. (ed.). *Politics of Orality*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-14540-5, ISBN 10: 90-04-14540-0
281. PETROVIC, I. *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp. Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15154-3, ISBN 10: 90-04-15154-0
282. PETROVIC, A. *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15153-6, ISBN 10: 90-04-15153-2
283. GAERTNER, J.F. (ed.). *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15515-2, ISBN 10: 90-04-15515-5
284. KORTEKAAS, G.A.A. *Commentary on the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15594-7, ISBN 10: 90-04-15594-5
285. BOEKE, H. *Wisdom in Pindar*. Gnomai, Cosmology and the Role of the Poet. ISBN 978 90 04 15848 1
286. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Granddaughter of the Sun*. A Study of Euripides' Medea. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16059 0
287. LAZARIDIS, N. *Wisdom in Loose Form*. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16058 3
288. JENNINGS, V. & A. KATSAROS (eds.). *The World of Ion of Chios*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16045 3